arXiv:1704.08582v1 [math.DG] 27 Apr 2017

PROJECTIVE ANOSOV REPRESENTATIONS, CONVEX COCOMPACT ACTIONS, AND RIGIDITY

ANDREW ZIMMER

Abstract. In this paper we show that many projective Anosov representations act convex cocompactly on some properly convex domain in real projective space. In particular, if a non-elementary word hyperbolic group is not commensurable to a non-trivial free product or the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface, then then any projective Anosov representation of that group acts convex cocompactly on some properly convex domain in real projective space. We also show that if a projective Anosov representation preserves a properly convex domain, then it acts convex cocompactly on some (possibly different) properly convex domain.

We then give three applications. First we show that Anosov representations into general semisimple Lie groups can be defined in terms of the existence of a convex cocompact action on a properly convex domain in some real projective space (which depends on the semisimple Lie group and parabolic subgroup). Next we prove a rigidity result involving the Hilbert entropy of a projective Anosov representation. Finally, we prove a rigidity result which shows that the image of the boundary map associated to a projective Anosov representation is rarely a C^2 submanifold of projective space. This final rigidity result also applies to Hitchin representations.

1. Introduction

If G is a connected semisimple Lie group with trivial center and $K \leq G$ is a maximal compact subgroup, then $X = G/K$ has a unique (up to scaling) Riemannian symmetric metric g so that $G = \mathrm{Isom}_0(X, g)$. The metric g is non-positively curved and X is simply connected, hence every two points in X are joined by a unique geodesic segment. A subset $\mathcal{C} \subset X$ is called *convex* if for every $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ the geodesic joining them is also in $\mathcal{C}$. Finally, a discrete group $\Gamma \leq G$ is said to be *convex cocompact* if there exists a closed convex set $\mathcal{C} \subset X$ so that $\gamma(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\Gamma \backslash \mathcal{C}$ is compact.

In the case in which G has real rank one, there are an abundance of examples of convex cocompact subgroups and one has the following characterization:

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose G is a rank one simple Lie group with trivial center, (X, g) is the symmetric space associated to G, and $\Gamma \leq G$ is a discrete subgroup. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *$\Gamma \leq G$ is a convex cocompact subgroup,*
2. *Γ is finitely generated and for some (hence any) $x \in X$ the map*

$$\gamma \in \Gamma \to \gamma \cdot x$$

induces a quasi-isometric embedding of Γ into X,

Date: April 28, 2017.

(3) Γ *is word hyperbolic and there exists an injective, continuous,* Γ*-equivariant map* $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to X(\infty)$.

Remark 1.2. For a proof of this theorem see Theorem 5.15 in [GW12] which relies on results in [Bou95].

When G has higher rank, the situation is much more rigid:

Theorem 1.3 (Kleiner-Leeb [KL06], Quint [Qui05])**.** *Suppose* G *is a simple Lie group with real rank at least two and* $\Gamma \leq G$ *is a Zariski dense discrete subgroup. If* Γ *is convex cocompact, then* Γ *is a cocompact lattice in* G.

Although the most natural definition of convex cocompact subgroups leads to no interesting examples in higher rank, it turns out that the third characterization in Theorem 1.1 can be used to define a rich class of representations called *Anosov representations*. This class of representations was originally introduced by Labourie [Lab06] and then extended by Guichard-Wienhard [GW12]. Since then several other characterizations have been given by Kapovich-Leeb-Porti [KLP13, KLP14b, KLP14a], Guéritaud-Guichard-Kassel-Wienhard [GGKW15], and Bochi-Potrie-Sambarino [BPS16].

We refer the reader to [GW12] for a precise definition of Anosov representations, but informally: if Γ is word hyperbolic, G is a semisimple Lie group, and P is a parabolic subgroup, then a representation $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is called P*-Anosov* if there exists an injective, continuous, ρ-equivariant map $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to G/P$ satisfying certain dynamical properties. In the case in which G has real rank one, every two parabolic subgroup are conjugate and the quotient G/P can naturally be identified with $X(\infty)$.

Recently, Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel established a close connection between Anosov representations into $\mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ and convex cocompact actions. However, the convex cocompact action is not on the associated symmetric space $X = \mathrm{PO}(p,q)/\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{O}(p)\times\mathrm{O}(q))$, but on a properly convex domain in the projective model of the pseudo-Riemannian hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$. In this context convex cocompact can be defined as follows:

Definition 1.4. [DGK17b] Let

$$\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1} = \{[x] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{p+q}) : \langle x, x\rangle_{p,q} < 0\}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{p,q}$ is the standard bilinear form of signature (p,q). Then an irreducible discrete subgroup $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ is called $\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$*-convex cocompact* if it acts properly discontinuously and cocompactly on some nonempty closed properly convex subset $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{p+q})$ so that $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$, $\mathcal{C}$ has non-empty interior, and $\overline{\mathcal{C}}\backslash\mathcal{C}$ contains no projective line segments.

Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel then proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5 (Danciger-Guéritaud-Kassel [DGK17b])**.** *For* $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ *with* $p+q \geq 3$*, let* Λ *be an irreducible discrete subgroup of* $\mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ *and let* $P_1^{p,q} \leq \mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ *be the stabilizer of an isotropic line in* $(\mathbb{R}^{p+q}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{p,q})$.

(1) *If* Λ *is* $\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$*-convex cocompact, then it is word hyperbolic and the inclusion representation* $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ *is* $P_1^{p,q}$*-Anosov.*
(2) *Conversely, if* Λ *is word hyperbolic,* $\partial\Lambda$ *is connected, and* $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ *is* $P_1^{p,q}$*-Anosov, then* Λ *is either* $\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$*-convex cocompact or* $\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$*-convex cocompact (after identifying* $\mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ *with* $\mathrm{PO}(q,p)$*).*

Remark 1.6. The special case when $q = 2$ and Λ is the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic p-manifold follows from work of Mess [Mes07] for $p = 2$ and work of Barbot-Mérigot [BM12] for $p \geq 3$.

In this paper we further explore connections between Anosov representations and convex cocompact actions on domains in real projective space. In the general case, we make the following definition:

Definition 1.7. Suppose V is a finite dimensional real vector space and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ is a properly convex domain, then a discrete subgroup $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts *convex cocompactly* on Ω if there exists a nonempty closed convex subset $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$ so that $g(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$ for all $g \in \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \backslash \mathcal{C}$ is compact.

In the context of Anosov representations a more refined notion of convex cocompact seems to be necessary: there exists properly convex domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ with convex cocompact subgroups $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ which are not word hyperbolic. To avoid such examples, we make the following stronger definition:

Definition 1.8. Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete subgroup. Then Λ is a *regular convex cocompact subgroup* of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ if there exists a closed convex subset $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$ so that $g(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$ for all $g \in \Lambda$, $\Lambda \backslash \mathcal{C}$ is compact, and every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 extreme point of Ω.

Remark 1.9. It turns out that $\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$-convex cocompact subgroups always satisfy this stronger condition. In particular, by Proposition 1.14 in [DGK17b]: If $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ is irreducible, discrete, and $\mathbb{H}^{p,q-1}$-convex cocompact, then there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{p+q})$ so that Λ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.

Finally we are ready to state our first main result.

Theorem 1.10. *(see Section 6) Suppose G is a semisimple Lie group with finite center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. Then there exists a finite dimensional real vector space V and an irreducible representation $\phi : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ with the following property: if Γ is a word hyperbolic group and $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is a Zariski dense representation with finite kernel, then the following are equivalent:*

1. *ρ is P-Anosov,*
2. *there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ so that $(\phi \circ \rho)(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.*

Properly convex domains and their projective automorphism groups have been extensively studied, especially in the case in which there exists a discrete group $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ so that $\Gamma \backslash \Omega$ is compact. Such domains are called *convex divisible domains* and have a number of remarkable properties, see the survey papers by Benoist [Ben08], Marquis [Mar14a], and Quint [Qui10].

Theorem 1.10 provides a way to use the rich theory of convex divisible domains to study general Anosov representations. For instance, the proofs of Theorem 1.34 and Theorem 1.45 below are inspired by rigidity results for convex divisible domains.

1.1. **Projective Anosov representations.** The first step in the proof of Theorem 1.10 is to use a result of Guichard and Wienhard to reduce to the case of projective Anosov representations. A projective Anosov representation is simply an P-Anosov representation in the special case when $G = \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and $P \leq \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$

is the stabilizer of a line. This special class of Anosov representations can be defined as follows:

Definition 1.11. Suppose that Γ is word hyperbolic, $\partial\Gamma$ is the Gromov boundary of Γ, and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is a representation. Two maps $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$ are called:

(1) *ρ-equivariant* if $\xi(\gamma x) = \rho(\gamma)\xi(x)$ and $\eta(\gamma x) = \rho(\gamma)\eta(x)$ for all $x \in \partial\Gamma$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$,
(2) *dynamics-preserving* if for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ of infinite order with attracting fixed point $x^+_\gamma \in \partial\Gamma$ the points $\xi(x^+_\gamma) \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta(x^+_\gamma) \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$ are attracting fixed points of the action of $\rho(\gamma)$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$, and
(3) *transverse* if for every distinct pair $x, y \in \partial\Gamma$ we have $\xi(x) + \ker \eta(y) = \mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 1.12. Given an element $g \in \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ let

$$\lambda_1(g) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_d(g)$$

be the absolute values of the eigenvalues of g counted with multiplicity.

Definition 1.13. Suppose that Γ is word hyperbolic, S is a finite symmetric generating set, and d_S is the induced word metric on Γ. Then for $\gamma \in \Gamma$, let $\ell_S(\gamma)$ denote the minimal translation distance of γ acting on the Cayley graph of (Γ, S), that is

$$\ell_S(\gamma) = \inf_{x \in \Gamma} d_S(\gamma x, x).$$

A representation $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is then called a *projective Anosov representation* if there exists continuous, ρ-equivariant, dynamics preserving, and transverse maps $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\eta : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$ and constants $C, c > 0$ so that

$$\log \frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_2(\rho(\gamma))} \geq C\ell_S(\gamma) - c$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

Remark 1.14. This is not the initial definition of Anosov representations given by Labourie [Lab06] or Guichard-Wienhard [GW12], but a nontrivial characterization proved in [GGKW15, Theorem 1.7]. We use this characterization as our definition because it is more elementary to state, but it is not necessary for any of the proofs in the paper.

Guichard and Wienhard proved the following connection between general Anosov representations and projective Anosov representations.

Theorem 1.15 (Guichard-Wienhard [GW12, Section 4])**.** *Suppose G is a semisimple Lie group with finite center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. Then there exists a finite dimensional real vector space V_0 and an irreducible representation $\phi_0 : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V_0)$ with the following property: if Γ is a word hyperbolic group and $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is a Zariski dense representation with finite kernel, then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *ρ is P-Anosov,*
(2) *$\phi_0 \circ \rho$ is projective Anosov.*

Remark 1.16. Proofs of this theorem can also be found in [GGKW15, Section 3] and [BCLS15, Subsection 2.3].

Using Theorem 1.15, the proof of Theorem 1.10 essentially reduces to the case of projective Anosov representations. In this case, we consider the following two questions:

Question 1.17.

(1) Given a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ and a convex cocompact subgroup $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$, what geometric conditions on Ω imply that the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is a projective Anosov representation?
(2) Given a projective Anosov representation $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ what conditions on ρ or Γ imply that $\rho(\Gamma)$ acts convex cocompactly on a properly convex domain in $\mathbb{P}(V)$?

Remark 1.18. Projective Anosov representations are closely related to the representations studied by Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel [DGK17b] in the $\mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ case. In particular, if $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ is a representation of a word hyperbolic group, then (essentially by definition) the following are equivalent:

(1) ρ is $P_1^{p,q}$-Anosov where $P_1^{p,q} \leq \mathrm{PO}(p,q)$ be the stabilizer of an isotropic line in $(\mathbb{R}^{p+q}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{p,q})$,
(2) ρ is projective Anosov when viewed as a representation into $\mathrm{PSL}_{p+q}(\mathbb{R})$.

Thus Theorem 1.5 provides answers to the above questions for projective Anosov representations whose images preserve a non-degenerate bilinear form.

1.2. **When a convex cocompact action leads to a projective Anosov representation.** When $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete group which acts cocompactly on Ω, Benoist has provided geometric conditions on Ω so that the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is projective Anosov:

Theorem 1.19 (Benoist [Ben04])**.** *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete group which acts cocompactly on Ω. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *Λ is word hyperbolic,*
(2) *$\partial\Omega$ is a C^1 hypersurface,*
(3) *Ω is strictly convex.*

Moreover, when these conditions are satisfied the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is projective Anosov.

The case of convex cocompact actions is more complicated as the next example shows:

Example 1.20. Let

$$C = \left\{(x_1, x_2, y) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : y > \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2}\right\}$$

then C is a properly convex cone and the group $\mathrm{SO}_0(1,2)$ preserves C. Let $\Lambda_0 \leq \mathrm{SO}_0(1,2)$ be a cocompact lattice. Next consider the properly convex domain

$$\Omega = \{[(v_1, v_2)] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^6) : v_1 \in C, v_2 \in C\}$$

and the discrete group

$$\Lambda = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \varphi & 0 \\ 0 & \varphi \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{PSL}_6(\mathbb{R}) : \varphi \in \Lambda_0 \right\}.$$

Then for any $\lambda \geq \mu > 0$, Λ acts cocompactly on the closed convex subset

$$\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\mu} = \{[(v, tv)] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^6) : \mu \leq t \leq \lambda, v \in C\} \subset \Omega.$$

This example has following properties:

(1) Λ is word hyperbolic (since Λ_0 is a word hyperbolic),
(2) the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_6(\mathbb{R})$ is not projective Anosov,
(3) $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a convex cocompact subgroup, but there is not a unique convex subset of Ω that Λ preserves and acts cocompactly on,
(4) when $\lambda > \mu$ there exists line segments in $\partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\mu}}$, and
(5) there exists points in $\partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}_{\lambda,\mu}}$ which are not C^1 points of Ω.

Despite examples like these, we will prove the following analogue of Benoist's theorem for convex cocompact subgroups:

Theorem 1.21. *(see Section 5) Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete irreducible subgroup of $\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. If Λ preserves and acts cocompactly on a closed convex subset $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$, then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$,*
(2) *every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is an extreme point of Ω*

Moreover, when these conditions are satisfied Λ is word hyperbolic and the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ is projective Anosov.

Remark 1.22.

(1) Theorem 1.21 can be seen as a generalization of Theorem 1.5 to the case when the representation is not assumed to preserve a non-degenerate bilinear form (see Remarks 1.9 and 1.18).
(2) This result was established independently by Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel, see Theorems 1.4 and 1.15 in [DGK17a] and Subsection 1.5 below.

1.3. **When a projective Anosov representation acts convex cocompactly.** In general a projective Anosov representations will not preserve a properly convex domain:

Example 1.23. Consider a cocompact lattice $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and consider the representation $\rho : \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ given by

$$\rho(g) = \begin{pmatrix} g & \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the induced representation $\rho|_\Lambda : \Lambda \to \mathrm{PSL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ is projective Anosov and the image of the boundary map is

$$\mathcal{L} := \{[x_1 : x_2 : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^3) : x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}, (x_1, x_2) \neq 0\}.$$

From this, it is easy to see that $\rho(\Lambda)$ cannot preserve a properly convex domain Ω because then we would have $\mathcal{L} \subset \partial\Omega$.

However with some mild conditions on Γ we can prove that every projective Anosov representation of Γ acts convex cocompactly on a properly convex domain.

Theorem 1.24. *(see Section 3) Suppose Γ is a non-elementary word hyperbolic group which is not commensurable to a non-trivial free product or the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface. If $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an irreducible projective Anosov representation, then there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.*

Remark 1.25. Work of Stallings implies that Γ is not commensurable to a non-trivial free product if and only if $\partial\Gamma$ is connected [Sta71, Sta68]. So Theorem 1.21 can be seen as an analogue of Theorem 1.5 in the case when the representation is not assumed to preserve a non-degenerate bilinear form.

We can also prove that once the image acts on some properly convex domain, then it acts convex cocompactly on some (possibly different) properly convex domain:

Theorem 1.26. *(see Section 3) Suppose Γ is a word hyperbolic group. If $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an irreducible projective Anosov representation and $\rho(\Gamma)$ preserves a properly convex domain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.*

Remark 1.27. This result was established independently by Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel, see Theorems 1.4 and 1.15 in [DGK17a] and Subsection 1.5 below.

Using Theorem 1.26, we can construct a convex cocompact action for any projective Anosov representation by post composing with another representation.

Example 1.28. Let $\mathrm{Sym}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be the vector space of symmetric d-by-d real matrices and consider the representation

$$S : \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{PSL}(\mathrm{Sym}_d(\mathbb{R}))$$

given by

$$S(g)X = gXg^{Tr}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{P} := \{[X] : X \in \mathrm{Sym}_d(\mathbb{R}) : X > 0\}$$

is a properly convex domain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Sym}_d(\mathbb{R}))$ and $S(\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P})$.

Combining Theorem 1.26 with the above examples establishes the following corollary.

Corollary 1.29. *Suppose Γ is a word hyperbolic group and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an irreducible projective Anosov representation. Let*

$$V = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\xi(x)\xi(x)^{Tr} : x \in \partial\Gamma\} \subset \mathrm{Sym}_d(\mathbb{R}).$$

Then there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ so that $(S \circ \rho)(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.

In the context of Theorem 1.26, it is also worth mentioning a theorem of Benoist which gives a necessary and sufficient condition for a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ to preserve a properly convex cone. Before stating Benoist theorem we need some terminology. A element $g \in \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is called *proximal* if it has a unique eigenvalue of maximal absolute value and a proximal element $g \in \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is called *positively proximal* if its unique eigenvalue of maximal absolute value is positive. Then a subgroup $G \leq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is called *positively proximal* if G contains a proximal element and every proximal element in G is positively proximal. With this language, Benoist proved the following:

Theorem 1.30 (Benoist [Ben00, Proposition 1.1])**.** *If $G \leq \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an irreducible subgroup, then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *G is positively proximal*

(2) *G preserves a properly convex cone $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.*

As an application, we will apply Theorem 1.26 and Benoist's theorem to Hitchin representations in certain dimensions.

Example 1.31. Suppose that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a cocompact lattice and $\iota : \Gamma \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is the inclusion representation. For $d > 2$, let $\tau_d : \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be the unique (up to conjugation) irreducible representation. Then the connected component of $\tau_d \circ \iota$ in $\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R}))$, denoted $\mathcal{H}_d(\Gamma)$, is called the *Hitchin component of Γ in* $\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Labourie [Lab06] proved that every representation in $\mathcal{H}_d(\Gamma)$ is projective Anosov (it is actually B-Anosov where $B \leq \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is a minimal parabolic subgroup).

Corollary 1.32. *Suppose that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a cocompact lattice and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is in the Hitchin component. If d is odd, then there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.*

Remark 1.33. This result was also established independently by Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel, see Proposition 1.7 in [DGK17a] and Subsection 1.5 below.

Since the proof is short we include it here:

Proof. Since d is odd, $\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R}) = \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, if we identify $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the vector space of homogenous polynomials of degree $d-1$ in two variables, then the representation $\tau_d : \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$\tau_d(g) \cdot P = P \circ g.$$

Then it is easy to see that if $g \in \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ has eigenvalues λ, λ^{-1} then $\tau_d(g)$ has eigenvalues

$$\lambda^{d-1}, \lambda^{d-3}, \dots, \lambda^{-(d-1)}.$$

Hence each eigenvalue of $\tau_d(g)$ is positive.

Now fix some $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_d(\Gamma)$. Since $\mathcal{H}_d(\Gamma)$ is connected, we see that $\rho(\Gamma)$ is positively proximal. So by Benoist's theorem $\rho(\Gamma)$ preserves a properly convex cone $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. So by Theorem 1.26, there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. □

1.4. **Other applications:**

1.4.1. *Entropy rigidity:* Suppose that Γ is a discrete group and let $[\Gamma]$ be the conjugacy classes of Γ. Then given a representation $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ define the *Hilbert entropy* to be

$$H_\rho = \limsup_{r \to \infty} \frac{1}{r} \log \# \left\{ [\gamma] \in [\Gamma] : \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_d(\rho(\gamma))} \right) \leq r \right\}.$$

Theorem 1.34. *(see Section 7) Suppose Γ is a word hyperbolic group and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an irreducible projective Anosov representation. If $\rho(\Gamma)$ preserves a properly convex domain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then*

$$H_\rho \leq d - 2$$

with equality if and only if $\rho(\Gamma)$ is conjugate to a cocompact lattice in $\mathrm{PO}(1, d-1)$.

Remark 1.35. Theorem 1.24 shows that Theorem 1.34 applies to many Anosov representations.

Theorem 1.34 is a generalization of a theorem of Crampon:

Theorem 1.36 (Crampon [Cra09])**.** *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete word hyperbolic group which acts cocompactly on Ω. If $\iota : \Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is the inclusion representation, then*

$$H_\iota \leq d-2$$

with equality if and only if Λ is conjugate to a cocompact lattice in $\mathrm{PO}(1,d-1)$.

Remark 1.37. In the context of Theorem 1.36, Theorem 1.19 implies that ι is a projective Anosov representation and so Theorem 1.34 is a true generalization of Theorem 1.36. Recently, Theorem 1.36 was also generalized in a different direction in [BMZ15].

Theorem 1.34 also improves, in some cases, bounds due to Sambarino:

Theorem 1.38 (Sambarino [Sam16, Theorem A])**.** *Suppose Γ is a convex cocompact group of a $\mathrm{CAT}(-1)$ space X and let $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an irreducible projective Anosov representation with $d \geq 3$. Then*

$$\alpha H_\rho \leq \delta_\Gamma(X)$$

where the boundary map $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is α-Hölder and $\delta_\Gamma(X)$ is the Poincaré exponent of Γ acting on X.

Remark 1.39. In Theorem 1.38, ξ is Hölder with respect to a visual metric of X restricted to the limit set of Γ and a distance on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ induced by a Riemannian metric. Sambarino also proves a rigidity result in the case when $\alpha H_\rho = \delta_\Gamma(X)$ and X is real hyperbolic k-space, for details see Corollary 3.1 in [Sam16].

Remark 1.40. For many convex cocompact groups of a $\mathrm{CAT}(-1)$ space, Theorem 1.34 combined with Theorem 1.24 provides a better upper bound when the Hölder constant is small.

1.4.2. *Regularity rigidity.* For certain types of projective Anosov representations, the image of the boundary map is actually a C^1 submanifold.

Example 1.41. Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete group which acts cocompactly on Ω. If Λ is word hyperbolic, then Theorem 1.19 implies that the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is projective Anosov. The image of the associated boundary map is $\partial\Omega$ which is a C^1 submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by Theorem 1.19.

Example 1.42. Suppose that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a cocompact lattice and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is in the Hitchin component. If $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the boundary map associated to ρ, then $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ is a C^1 submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, see the discussion [Lab06].

In both of theses cases it is known that the image of the boundary map cannot be too regular unless the representation is very special.

Theorem 1.43 (Benoist [Ben04])**.** *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete group which acts cocompactly on Ω. If $\partial\Omega$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ hypersurface for every $\alpha \in (0,1)$, then Ω is projectively isomorphic to the ball and hence Λ is conjugate to a cocompact lattice in $\mathrm{PO}(1,d-1)$.*

Theorem 1.44 (Potrie-Sambarino [PS14])**.** *Suppose that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a cocompact lattice and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is in the Hitchin component. If $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the associated boundary map and $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ is a C^∞ submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then there exists a representation $\rho_0 : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\rho = \tau_d \circ \rho_0$.*

Using Theorem 1.24, we will prove the following:

Theorem 1.45. *(see Section 8) Suppose $d > 2$, Γ is a word hyperbolic group, and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an irreducible projective Anosov representation with boundary map $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. If*

1. *$M = \xi(\partial\Gamma)$ is a C^2 k-dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and*
2. *the representation $\wedge^{k+1}\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ is irreducible,*

then

$$\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_2(\rho(\gamma))} = \frac{\lambda_{k+1}(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{k+2}(\rho(\gamma))}$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

Remark 1.46.

1. Notice that the regularity assumption concerns the set $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ and not the map $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
2. As before
$$\lambda_1(g) \geq \lambda_2(g) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_d(g)$$
are the absolute values of the eigenvalues of $g \in \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ counted with multiplicity.
3. Theorem 1.24 is only needed in the case when $k > 1$.

When $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ has Zariski dense image, then ρ and $\wedge^{k+1}\rho$ are irreducible. Moreover in this case the main result in [Ben97] implies that there exists some $\gamma \in \Gamma$ so that

$$\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_2(\rho(\gamma))} \neq \frac{\lambda_{k+1}(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{k+2}(\rho(\gamma))}.$$

So we have the following corollary of Theorem 8.1:

Corollary 1.47. *Suppose $d > 2$, Γ is a word hyperbolic group, and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is a Zariski dense projective Anosov representation with boundary map $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ is not a C^2 submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.*

When $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a cocompact lattice and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is in the Hitchin component, then the representations ρ and $\wedge^2\rho$ are irreducible by [Lab06] and so we have the following corollary of Theorem 8.1:

Corollary 1.48. *Suppose that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is a cocompact lattice and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is in the Hitchin component. If $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the associated boundary map and $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ is a C^2 submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then*

$$\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_2(\rho(\gamma))} = \frac{\lambda_2(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_3(\rho(\gamma))}$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

Remark 1.49. This corollary greatly restricts the Zariski closure of $\rho(\Gamma)$ when ρ is Hitchin and $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ is a C^2 submanifold (see [Ben97] again). In particular, the corollary implies that in this case:

(1) $\rho(\Gamma)$ cannot be Zariski dense,
(2) if $d = 2n > 2$, then the Zariski closure of $\rho(\Gamma)$ cannot be conjugate to $\mathrm{PSp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$,
(3) if $d = 2n + 1 > 3$ then the Zariski closure of $\rho(\Gamma)$ cannot be conjugate to $\mathrm{PSO}(n, n + 1)$, and
(4) if $d = 7$, then the Zariski closure of $\rho(\Gamma)$ cannot be conjugate to the standard realization of G_2 in $\mathrm{PSL}_7(\mathbb{R})$.

See Section B in the appendix for details.

Although there is currently no proof in the literature, it is claimed that these are the only possibilities for the Zariski closure of $\rho(\Gamma)$ when ρ is Hitchin but not Fuchsian (that is conjugate to a representation of the form $\tau_d \circ \rho_0$), see for instance [BCLS15, Section 11.3].

1.5. **Convex cocompactness in the work of Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel.** After I finished writing this paper, Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel informed me of their preprint [DGK17a] which has some overlapping results with this paper. They consider a class of subgroups of $\mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ which they call *strongly convex cocompact* which (using the terminology of this paper) are discrete subgroups $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ which act convex cocompactly on a properly convex domain which is strictly convex and has C^1 boundary. This notion appears to be first studied in work of Crampon and Marquis [CM14]. Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel also show (stated with different terminology) that if $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup (as in Definition 1.8), then it is actually a strongly convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{PGL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, that is there exists a possibly different properly convex domain Ω' where $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega')$ is a convex cocompact subgroup and Ω' is a strictly convex domain with C^1 boundary (see Theorem 1.15 in [DGK17a]). Danciger, Guéritaud, and Kassel also study a notion of convex cocompact actions on general properly convex domains (see Definition 1.11 in [DGK17a]) that is different than the one we consider in Definition 1.7 above.

The main overlap in the two papers is in Theorems 1.21, 1.26, and Corollary 1.32 above and Theorems 1.4, 1.15 and Proposition 1.7 in [DGK17b].

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Thomas Barthelmé and Ludovic Marquis for many helpful conversations. In particular, we jointly observed the fact that an argument due to G. Liu could be used to prove Proposition 7.4 during the course of writing our paper *Entropy rigidity of Hilbert and Riemannian metrics* [BMZ15].

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Number NSF 1400919.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we recall some facts that we will use in the arguments that follow.

2.1. **Slightly nonstandard notations.**

(1) If $M \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a C^1 k-dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $m \in M$ we will let $T_m M \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the k-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ which is tangent to M at m.

(2) Given some object o we will let $[o]$ be the projective equivalence class of o, for instance: if $v \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ let $[v]$ denote the image of v in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, if $\phi \in \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ let $[\phi]$ denote the image of ϕ in $\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, and if $T \in \mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$ let $[T]$ denote the image of T in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^d))$.
(3) A *line segment* in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a connected subset of a projective line. Given two points $x, y \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ there is no canonical line segment with endpoints p and q, but we will use the following convention: if Ω is a properly convex domain and $x, y \in \overline{\Omega}$, then when the context is clear we will let $[x, y]$ denote the line segment joining x to y which is contained in $\overline{\Omega}$. In this case, we will also let $(x, y) = [x, y] \setminus \{x, y\}$, $[x, y) = [x, y] \setminus \{y\}$, and $(x, y] = [x, y] \setminus \{x\}$.

2.2. **Gromov hyperbolicity.** Suppose (X, d) is a metric space. If $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval, a curve $\sigma : I \to X$ is a *geodesic* if

$$d(\sigma(t_1), \sigma(t_2)) = |t_1 - t_2|$$

for all $t_1, t_2 \in I$. A *geodesic triangle* in a metric space is a choice of three points in X and geodesic segments connecting these points. A geodesic triangle is said to be δ-*thin* if any point on any of the sides of the triangle is within distance δ of the other two sides.

Definition 2.1. A proper geodesic metric space (X, d) is called δ-*hyperbolic* if every geodesic triangle is δ-thin. If (X, d) is δ-hyperbolic for some $\delta \geq 0$ then (X, d) is called *Gromov hyperbolic*.

We will use the following weaker characterization of Gromov hyperbolicity:

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose (X, d) is a geodesic proper metric space, $\delta > 0$, and there exists a map*

$$(x, y) \in X \times X \to \sigma_{x,y} \in C([0, d(x, y)], X)$$

where $\sigma_{x,y}$ is a geodesic segment joining x to y. If for every $x, y, z \in X$ distinct, the geodesic triangle formed by $\sigma_{x,y}, \sigma_{y,z}, \sigma_{z,x}$ is δ-thin, then (X, d) is Gromov hyperbolic.

Proof. Define the Gromov product of $y, z \in X$ with respect to x to be

$$(y|z)_x := \frac{1}{2} \left(d(y, x) + d(z, x) - d(y, z) \right).$$

Then using the argument in the proof of Proposition 1.22 in Chapter III.H in [BH99], there exists some $\delta_0 > 0$ so that

$$(x|y)_w \geq \min\{(x|z)_w, (y|z)_w\} - \delta_0$$

for all $w, x, y, z \in X$. But then Proposition 1.22 in Chapter III.H in [BH99] implies that there exists some $\delta_1 > 0$ so that every geodesic triangle in X is δ_1-thin. □

By combining several deep theorems from geometric group theory we can deduce the following:

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose Γ is a non-elementary word hyperbolic group which does not split over a finite group and is not commensurable to the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface. Then*

(1) *$\partial\Gamma$ is connected,*
(2) *$\partial\Gamma - \{x\}$ is connected for every $x \in \partial\Gamma$, and*

(3) *there exists* $u, w \in \partial\Gamma$ *distinct so that* $\partial\Gamma - \{u, v\}$ *is connected.*

The argument below essentially comes from the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [Pap05].

Proof. By work of Stallings, $\partial\Gamma$ is disconnected if and only if Γ splits over a finite group [Sta71, Sta68]. Since $\partial\Gamma$ is connected, a theorem of Swarup [Swa96] implies that $\partial\Gamma - \{x\}$ is connected for every $x \in \partial\Gamma$.

Now suppose for a contradiction that $\partial\Gamma - \{u, v\}$ is disconnected for every $u, v \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct. Then $\partial\Gamma$ is homeomorphic to the circle by [New92, Chapter IV, Theorem 12.1]. But then by work of Gabai [Gab92] and Tukia [Tuk88], Γ is commensurable to the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface. □

2.3. **Properly convex domains.**

Definition 2.4. A set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is called a *properly convex domain* if it is open, connected, and for every projective line $L \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the set $L \cap \Omega$ is connected and $\overline{L \cap \Omega} \neq L$.

Given a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the *dual set* is defined to be:

$$\Omega^* = \{f \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*}) : f(x) \neq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}\}.$$

The set Ω^* is a properly convex domain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$ and the two sets have the following relation:

Observation 2.5. If $f \in \partial\Omega^*$ then $\ker f$ is a supporting hyperplane of Ω.

2.4. **The Hilbert metric.** For distinct points $x, y \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ let $\overline{xy}$ be the projective line containing them. Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is a properly convex domain. If $x, y \in \Omega$ let a, b be the two points in $\overline{xy} \cap \partial\Omega$ ordered a, x, y, b along $\overline{xy}$. Then define *the Hilbert distance between* x *and* y *to be*

$$H_\Omega(x, y) = \log[a, x, y, b]$$

where

$$[a, x, y, b] = \frac{|x - b|\,|y - a|}{|x - a|\,|y - b|}$$

is the cross ratio. Using the invariance of the $[a, x, y, b]$ under projective maps and the convexity of Ω it is possible to show:

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *is a properly convex domain. Then* H_Ω *is a complete* $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$*-invariant metric on* Ω *which generates the standard topology on* Ω*. Moreover, if* $p, q \in \Omega$ *then there exists a geodesic joining* p *and* q *whose image is the line segment* $[p, q]$*.*

We will use the following estimate:

Lemma 2.7 (see Lemma 8.3 in [Cra09])**.** *Suppose* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *is a properly convex domain and* $[a, b], [c, d] \subset \Omega$ *are line segments. If* $p \in [a, b]$*, then*

$$H_\Omega(p, [c, d]) \leq H_\Omega(a, c) + H_\Omega(b, d).$$

We will also use the Gromov product induced by the Hilbert metric: given a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ define the *Gromov product of* $p, q \in \Omega$ *based at* $o \in \Omega$ to be

$$(p|q)_o^\Omega = \frac{1}{2}\left(H_\Omega(p, o) + H_\Omega(o, q) - H_\Omega(p, q)\right).$$

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is a properly convex domain, $p_n \in \Omega$ is a sequence with $p_n \to \xi \in \partial\Omega$, and $q_m \in \Omega$ is a sequence with $q_m \to \eta \in \partial\Omega$. Then:*

(1) *If $\eta = \xi$, then*

$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} (p_n|q_m)_o^\Omega = \infty.$$

(2) *If*

$$\limsup_{n,m\to\infty} (p_n|q_m)_o^\Omega = \infty,$$

then $[\xi, \eta] \subset \partial\Omega$.

Proof. Both parts are simple consequences of the fact that every line segment in Ω can be parametrized to be a geodesic.

First suppose that $p_n, q_m \in \Omega$ both converge to some $\xi \in \partial\Omega$. Let $\sigma_n : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \Omega$ and $\overline{\sigma}_m : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \Omega$ be the geodesic rays in (Ω, H_Ω) whose images are line segments so that $\sigma_n(0) = \overline{\sigma}_m(0) = o$ and $\sigma_n(T_n) = p_n$, $\overline{\sigma}_m(S_m) = q_m$ for some $T_n, S_m \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Then if $t \leq \min\{T_n, S_m\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2(p_n|q_m)_o^\Omega &= 2t + H_\Omega(p_n, \sigma_n(t)) + H_\Omega(\sigma_n(t), q_m) - H_\Omega(p_n, q_m) \\ &\geq 2t - H_\Omega(\sigma_n(t), \overline{\sigma}_m(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\limsup_{n,m\to\infty} H_\Omega(\sigma_n(t), \overline{\sigma}_m(t)) = 0$$

for any fixed $t > 0$, we then see that

$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} (p_n|q_m)_o^\Omega = \infty.$$

Next suppose that $p_n \to \xi \in \partial\Omega$, $q_m \to \eta \in \partial\Omega$, and

$$\limsup_{n,m\to\infty} (p_n|q_m)_o^\Omega = \infty.$$

By passing to subsequences we can suppose that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} (p_n|q_n)_o^\Omega = \infty.$$

Next let $\sigma_n : [0, R_n] \to \Omega$ be a geodesic joining p_n to q_n whose image is a straight line. Then for any $t \in [0, R_n]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2(p_n|q_m)_o^\Omega &= H_\Omega(p_n, o) + H_\Omega(o, q_m) - H_\Omega(p_n, \sigma_n(t)) - H_\Omega(\sigma_n(t), q_m) \\ &\leq 2H_\Omega(o, \sigma_n(t)) \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(p_n|q_n)_o^\Omega \leq \inf_{t\in[0,R_n]} H_\Omega(\sigma_n(t), o).$$

Since the image of σ_n is the line segment $[p_n, q_n]$ we then must have $[\xi, \eta] \subset \partial\Omega$. □

2.5. **Anosov representations.** We will use the following fact repeatedly:

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose that Γ is a word hyperbolic group. Let $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an irreducible projective Anosov representation with boundary maps $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$. If $\gamma_n \in \Gamma$ is a sequence so that $\gamma_n \to x^+ \in \partial\Gamma$ and $\gamma_n^{-1} \to x^- \in \partial\Gamma$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \rho(\gamma_n)v = \xi(x^+)$$

for all $v \notin \ker \eta(x^-)$.

Proof. We first consider the case in which $\#\partial\Gamma = 2$. Then since ρ is irreducible, $d = 2$ and the lemma follows easily from the dynamics of 2-by-2 matrices acting on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

So suppose that $\#\partial\Gamma > 2$. Then $\#\partial\Gamma = \infty$ and $\partial\Gamma$ is a perfect space. Viewing $\rho(\gamma_n)$ as an element of $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, it is enough to show that $\rho(\gamma_n)$ converges to the element $T \in \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with $\ker(T) = \ker \eta(x^-)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(T) = \xi(x^+)$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is compact it is enough to show that every convergent subsequence of $\rho(\gamma_n)$ converges to T. So suppose that $\rho(\gamma_n) \to S$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^d))$.

We first claim that $\mathrm{Im}(S) = \xi(x^+)$. Now since $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is irreducible, there exists $x_1, \ldots, x_d \in \partial\Gamma$ so that $\xi(x_1), \ldots, \xi(x_d)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^d$. Since $\partial\Gamma$ is a perfect space, we can perturb the x_i (if necessary) and assume that

$$x^- \notin \{x_1, \ldots, x_d\}.$$

Then $\gamma_n x_i \to x^+$ and since ξ is ρ-equivariant, we then see that $\rho(\gamma_n)\xi(x_i) \to \xi(x^+)$. Since $\xi(x_1), \ldots, \xi(x_{d+1})$ spans $\mathbb{R}^d$ this implies that

$$\mathrm{Im}(S) = \xi(x^+).$$

Next view ${}^t\rho(\gamma_n)$ as an element of $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^{d*}))$, then ${}^t\rho(\gamma_n)$ converges to ${}^tS$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^{d*}))$. Since

$${}^t\rho(\gamma_n)\eta(x) = \eta(\gamma_n^{-1}x),$$

repeating the argument above shows that

$$\mathrm{Im}({}^tS) = \eta(x^-).$$

But this implies that

$$\ker S = \ker \eta(x^-).$$

□

This lemma has the following corollary:

Corollary 2.10. *Suppose that Γ is a word hyperbolic group. Let $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an irreducible projective Anosov representation with boundary maps $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$. If $\rho(\Gamma)$ preserves a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ then*

$$\xi(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega \text{ and } \eta(\partial\Omega) \subset \partial\Omega^*.$$

Proof. Fix some $x \in \partial\Gamma$. Then there exists $\gamma_n \in \Gamma$ so that $\gamma_n \to x$. Now suppose that $\gamma_n^{-1} \to x^-$. Since Ω is open, there exists some $v \in \Omega \setminus \ker \eta(x^-)$. Then

$$\xi(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho(\gamma_n)v \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

On the other hand, ρ has finite kernel and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts properly on Ω and so we must have $\xi(x) \in \partial\Omega$. Since $x \in \partial\Gamma$ was an arbitrary point we then have $\xi(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega$.

Repeating the above argument on Ω^* shows that $\eta(\partial\Omega) \subset \partial\Omega^*$. □

3. Constructing a convex cocompact action

In this section we establish Theorems 1.24 and 1.26 from the introduction. The argument has two parts: first we show that we can lift the boundary maps ξ, η to maps into $\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^{d*}$ and then we will show that whenever we can lift ξ, η we obtain a regular convex cocompact action.

3.1. **Lifting the maps.** Before stating the theorem we need some notation: let $S^{d-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $S^{(d-1)*} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d*}$ be the unit spheres and let

$$\mathrm{SL}_d^{\pm}(\mathbb{R}) = \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}) : \det g = \pm 1\}.$$

In the statement and proof of the next theorem we will also use the standard action of $\mathrm{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ on S^{d-1} and $S^{(d-1)*}$ given by

$$g \cdot v = \frac{gv}{\|gv\|} \text{ and } g \cdot f = \frac{f \circ g^{-1}}{\|f \circ g^{-1}\|}.$$

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose Γ is a word hyperbolic group. Let $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an irreducible projective Anosov representation with boundary maps $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$.*

If one of the following conditions hold:

1. *Γ is a non-elementary word hyperbolic group which is not commensurable to a non-trivial free product or the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface,*
2. *there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega_0)$,*

then there exists lifts $\widetilde{\rho} : \Gamma \to \mathrm{SL}_d^{\pm}(\mathbb{R})$, $\widetilde{\xi} : \partial\Gamma \to S^{d-1}, \widetilde{\eta} : \partial\Gamma \to S^{(d-1)*}$ of ρ, ξ, η respectively so that $\widetilde{\xi}$ and $\widetilde{\eta}$ are continuous, $\widetilde{\rho}$-equivariant, and

$$\widetilde{\eta}(y)\Big(\widetilde{\xi}(x)\Big) > 0$$

for all $x, y \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We will consider each case separately.

Case 1: Suppose that Γ is a non-elementary word hyperbolic group which is not commensurable to a non-trivial free product or a fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface.

Let $\Lambda = \rho(\Gamma)$. Then by Selberg's lemma Λ has a torsion-free finite index subgroup Λ_0. Moreover, Λ_0 is commensurable to Γ and $\partial\Lambda_0$ is homeomorphic to $\partial\Gamma$. Since Λ_0 is torsion-free, the condition of Γ implies that Λ_0 does not split over a finite group and is not commensurable to the fundamental group of a closed hyperbolic surface. Hence by Theorem 2.3, we see that

1. $\partial\Gamma$ is connected,
2. $\partial\Gamma - \{x\}$ is connected for every $x \in \partial\Gamma$, and
3. there exists $u, w \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct so that $\partial\Gamma - \{u, v\}$ is connected.

We next show that there exists some $f \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$ so that $\xi(\partial\Gamma) \cap \ker f = \emptyset$. Let $u, w \in \partial\Gamma$ be two distinct points so that $\partial\Gamma - \{u, w\}$ is connected. By making a change of coordinates we can assume that

(1) $\xi(u) = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$,
(2) $\xi(w) = [0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$,
(3) $\ker \eta(u) = \{[x_1 : 0 : x_2 : \cdots : x_{d-1}] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}\}$, and
(4) $\ker \eta(w) = \{[0 : x_1 : x_2 : \cdots : x_{d-1}] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Then the space $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus (\ker \eta(u) \cup \ker \eta(w))$ has two connected components, namely

$$A_+ = \{[1 : x_1 : x_2 : \cdots : x_{d-1}] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}, x_1 > 0\}$$

and

$$A_- = \{[1 : x_1 : x_2 : \cdots : x_{d-1}] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}, x_1 < 0\}.$$

Since $\partial\Gamma - \{u, w\}$ is connected and $\xi(\partial\Gamma - \{u, w\}) \subset A_- \cup A_+$, we can assume that

$$\xi(\partial\Gamma - \{u, w\}) \subset A_+.$$

Then let $f \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$ be the element satisfying

$$\ker f = \{[x_1 : -x_1 : x_2, \ldots, x_{d-1}] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Clearly $\xi(u) \notin \ker f$, $\xi(w) \notin \ker f$, and $A_+ \cap \ker f = \emptyset$, hence

$$\xi(\partial\Gamma) \cap \ker f = \emptyset.$$

Next let $\widetilde{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{d*}$ be a functional so that $\left[\widetilde{f}\right] = f$. Then for each $x \in \partial\Gamma$ there exists a unique representative $\widetilde{\xi}(x) \in S^{d-1}$ of $\xi(x)$ so that

$$f\left(\widetilde{\xi}(x)\right) > 0.$$

Using uniqueness, we see that $\widetilde{\xi} : \partial\Gamma \to S^{d-1}$ is continuous.

Now for $x \in \partial\Gamma$ let $H_x \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the hyperspace so that $[H_x] = \ker \eta(x)$. Since $[H_x] \cap \xi(\partial\Gamma) = \{\xi(x)\}$ we see that

$$H_x \cap \widetilde{\xi}(\partial\Gamma) = \left\{\widetilde{\xi}(x)\right\}.$$

Now since $S^{d-1} \setminus H_x$ has two connected components and $\partial\Gamma - \{x\}$ is connected we see that there exists a unique lift $\widetilde{\eta}(x) \in S^{(d-1)*}$ of $\eta(x)$ so that

$$\widetilde{\eta}(x)\left(\widetilde{\xi}(y)\right) \geq 0$$

with equality if and only if $x = y$. Using uniqueness, we see that $\widetilde{\eta} : \partial\Gamma \to S^{(d-1)*}$ is continuous.

Now for $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{\mathrm{id}\}$ and let $\widetilde{g}_\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be a representative of $\rho(\gamma)$. Then for each $x \in \partial\Gamma$ we have

$$\widetilde{g}_\gamma \cdot \widetilde{\xi}(x) = \pm\widetilde{\xi}(\gamma x).$$

Then define subsets $B_\gamma^+, B_\gamma^- \subset \partial\Gamma$ by

$$B_\gamma^\pm = \left\{x \in \partial\Gamma : \left\langle \widetilde{g}_\gamma \cdot \widetilde{\xi}(x), \widetilde{\xi}(\gamma x)\right\rangle = \pm 1\right\}.$$

Since the map $\widetilde{\xi} : \partial\Gamma \to S^{d-1}$ is continuous and $\partial\Gamma$ is connected, either $\partial\Gamma = B_\gamma^+$ or $\partial\Gamma = B_\gamma^-$. In the case in which $\partial\Gamma = B_\gamma^+$ define $\widetilde{\rho}(\gamma) = \widetilde{g}_\gamma$ and in the case in which $\partial\Gamma = B_\gamma^-$ define $\widetilde{\rho}(\gamma) = -\widetilde{g}_\gamma$.

Then it is clear that $\widetilde{\rho} : \Gamma \to \mathrm{SL}_d^{\pm}(\mathbb{R})$ is a homomorphism and $\widetilde{\xi}, \widetilde{\eta}$ are $\widetilde{\rho}$-equivariant.

Case 2: Suppose that there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega_0 \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega_0)$.

Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the natural projection. Since Ω_0 is properly convex, $\pi^{-1}(\Omega_0)$ has two connected components $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$. Moreover $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ are properly convex cones and $\mathcal{C}_1 = -\mathcal{C}_2$.

By Corollary 2.10, we see that $\xi(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega_0$ and $\eta(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega_0^*$. Now for $x \in \partial\Gamma$ let $\widetilde{\xi}(x) \in S^{d-1}$ be the unique representative of $\xi(x)$ so that $\widetilde{\xi}(x) \in \overline{\mathcal{C}_1}$ and let $\widetilde{\eta}(x) \in S^{(d-1)*}$ be the unique representative of $\eta(x)$ so that

$$\widetilde{\eta}(x)(v) > 0$$

for all $v \in \mathcal{C}_1$. Then by construction,

$$\widetilde{\eta}(x)\left(\widetilde{\xi}(y)\right) \geq 0$$

with equality if and only if $x = y$. Moreover, uniqueness implies that $\widetilde{\xi}$ and $\widetilde{\eta}$ are continuous.

Now for $\gamma \in \Gamma$ let $\widetilde{\rho}(\gamma) \in \mathrm{SL}_d^{\pm}(\mathbb{R})$ be the unique lift that preserves $\mathcal{C}_1$. Then $\widetilde{\rho} : \Gamma \to \mathrm{SL}_d^{\pm}(\mathbb{R})$ is a homomorphism and $\widetilde{\xi}$ and $\widetilde{\eta}$ are $\widetilde{\rho}$-equivariant.

□

3.2. **Showing the action is convex cocompact.**

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose Γ is a word hyperbolic group. Let $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be an irreducible projective Anosov representation with boundary maps $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\eta : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$.*

If there exists lifts $\widetilde{\rho} : \Gamma \to \mathrm{SL}_d^{\pm}(\mathbb{R})$, $\widetilde{\xi} : \partial\Gamma \to S^{d-1}, \widetilde{\eta} : \partial\Gamma \to S^{(d-1)*}$ of ρ, ξ, η respectively so that $\widetilde{\xi}$ and $\widetilde{\eta}$ are continuous, $\widetilde{\rho}$-equivariant, and

$$\widetilde{\eta}(y)\Big(\widetilde{\xi}(x)\Big) > 0$$

for all $x, y \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct, then there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.

For the rest of the subsection let Γ, ρ, ξ, η, $\widetilde{\rho}$, $\widetilde{\xi}$, and $\widetilde{\eta}$ satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 3.2.

Define

$$\Omega := \left\{ [v] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \widetilde{\eta}(x)(v) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in \partial\Gamma \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.3. *With the notation above, Ω is a properly convex domain, $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$, and if $N > 1$; $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N > 0$; and $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ are distinct then*

$$\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i) \right] \in \Omega.$$

Proof. By construction Ω is convex. By hypothesis if $N > 1$; $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N > 0$; and $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ are distinct then

$$\widetilde{\eta}(y)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i)\right) > 0$$

for all $y \in \partial\Gamma$. So

$$\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i)\right] \in \Omega.$$

Since ρ is an irreducible representation, we see that $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\eta(\partial\Gamma)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^{d*}$. Then since $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^d$ we see that Ω is open. And since $\eta(\partial\Gamma)$ spans $\mathbb{R}^{d*}$ and

$$\Omega \cap \ker \eta(x) = \emptyset$$

for all $x \in \partial\Gamma$, we see that Ω is properly convex. Finally, since

$$\rho(\gamma)[v] = [\widetilde{\rho}(\gamma)(v)]$$

when $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we see that $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. □

Lemma 3.4. *With the notation above, $\xi(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega$ and $\eta(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega^*$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary 2.10, but here is a direct proof: by the definition of Ω we see that $\eta(\partial\Gamma) \subset \overline{\Omega^*}$. Moreover, since

$$\left\{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i)\right] : N > 1; \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N > 0; \text{ and } x_1, \dots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma \text{ are distinct}\right\} \subset \Omega$$

we see that $\xi(\partial\Gamma) \subset \overline{\Omega}$. Then, since

$$\eta(x)(\xi(x)) = 0$$

for all $x \in \partial\Gamma$ we see that $\xi(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega$ and $\eta(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega^*$. □

Given a set $A \subset \Omega$ and a point $p \in \Omega$ define

$$H_\Omega(p, A) := \inf_{a \in A} H_\Omega(p, a).$$

Then given two sets $A, B \subset \Omega$ define the *Hausdorff distance in H_Ω between A and B* to be:

$$H_{\Omega,\mathrm{Haus}}(A, B) := \max\left\{\sup_{a \in A} H_\Omega(a, B), \sup_{b \in B} H_\Omega(b, A)\right\}.$$

Next fix a finite, symmetric generating set S of Γ and let d_S be the induced word metric on Γ.

Lemma 3.5. *With the notation above, suppose that $p_0 \in \Omega$. Then there exist some $R > 0$ with the following property: if $g_1, \dots, g_N \in \Gamma$ is a geodesic in (Γ, d_S) then*

$$H_{\Omega,\mathrm{Haus}}\Big(\{\rho(g_1)p_0, \dots, \rho(g_N)p_0\}, [\rho(g_1)p_0, \rho(g_N)p_0]\Big) \leq R.$$

Proof. We first claim that there exists some $R_1 > 0$ with the following property: if $g_1, \dots, g_N \in \Gamma$ is a geodesic in (Γ, d_S), then

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} H_\Omega\Big(\rho(g_i)p_0, [\rho(g_1)p_0, \rho(g_N)p_0]\Big) \leq R_1.$$

Suppose not, then (after possibly translating by Γ) we can assume: for any $n > 0$ there exists a geodesic $g_{-M_n}^{(n)}, g_{-M_n+1}^{(n)}, \dots, g_{N_n}^{(n)}$ in Γ so that $g_0^{(n)} = \mathrm{id}$ and

$$H_\Omega\left(\rho\left(g_0^{(n)}\right)p_0, \left[\rho\left(g_{-M_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0, \rho\left(g_{N_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0\right]\right) = H_\Omega\left(p_0, \left[\rho\left(g_{-M_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0, \rho\left(g_{N_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0\right]\right) > n.$$

Notice that we must have $M_n, N_n \to \infty$. Now by passing to a subsequence, we can suppose that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g_i^{(n)} = g_i \text{ for all } i.$$

Then $\dots, g_{-2}, g_{-1}, g_0 = \mathrm{id}, g_1, g_2, \dots$ is a geodesic in Γ, so there exists $x^+, x^- \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct so that

$$\lim_{i\to\pm\infty} g_i = x^\pm.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g_{N_n}^{(n)} = x^+$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} g_{-M_n}^{(n)} = x^-.$$

Now $\ker \eta(x^-) \cap \Omega = \emptyset$ (by the definition of Ω). So Lemma 2.9 implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \rho\left(g_{N_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0 = \xi(x^+).$$

The same reasoning implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \rho\left(g_{-M_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0 = \xi(x^-).$$

Since $x^+, x^- \in \partial\Gamma$ are distinct, Lemma 3.3 implies that $(\xi(x^-), \xi(x^+)) \subset \Omega$ and so

$$H_\Omega\left(p_0, (\xi(x^-), \xi(x^+))\right) < \infty.$$

Then since

$$\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} H_\Omega\left(p_0, \left[\rho\left(g_{-M_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0, \rho\left(g_{N_n}^{(n)}\right)p_0\right]\right) = H_\Omega\left(p_0, (\xi(x^-), \xi(x^+))\right) < \infty$$

we have a contradiction. Hence, there exists some $R_1 > 0$ so that if $g_1, \dots, g_N \in \Gamma$ is a geodesic in (Γ, d_S) then

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} H_\Omega\left(\rho(g_i)p_0, [\rho(g_1)p_0, \rho(g_N)p_0]\right) \leq R_1.$$

Now let

$$C = \max\{H_\Omega(p_0, \rho(g)p_0) : g \in S\}.$$

We claim that: if $g_1, \dots, g_N \in \Gamma$ is a geodesic in (Γ, d_S) and if $p \in [\rho(g_1)p_0, \rho(g_N)p_0]$, then

$$H_\Omega\left(p, \{\rho(g_1)p_0, \dots, \rho(g_N)p_0\}\right) \leq 2R_1 + \frac{1}{2}C.$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq N$, let p_i be a closest point to $\rho(g_i)p_0$ in $[\rho(g_1)p_0, \rho(g_N)p_0]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} H_\Omega(p_i, p_{i+1}) &\leq H_\Omega(p_i, \rho(g_i)p_0) + H_\Omega(\rho(g_i)p_0, \rho(g_{i+1})p_0) + H_\Omega(\rho(g_{i+1})p_0, p_{i+1}) \\ &\leq R_1 + C + R_1 = 2R_1 + C. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p_1 = \rho(g_1)p_0$ and $p_N = \rho(g_N)p_0$ we see that: for any $p \in [\rho(g_1)p_0, \rho(g_N)p_0]$

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} H_\Omega(p, p_i) \leq \frac{1}{2}(2R_1 + C) = R_1 + \frac{1}{2}C$$

and so

$$H_\Omega\left(p, \{\rho(g_1)p_0, \ldots, \rho(g_N)p_0\}\right) \leq 2R_1 + \frac{1}{2}C.$$

So $R = 2R_1 + C/2$ satisfies the conclusion of the lemma. □

Lemma 3.6. *With the notation above, suppose that $p_0 \in \Omega$. For any $N > 1$ there exists $C_N > 0$ so that: if*

$$p = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i)\right]$$

where $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N > 0$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ are distinct then

$$H_\Omega(p, \rho(\Gamma) \cdot p_0) \leq C_N.$$

Proof. We induct on N. The $N = 2$ case follows from the Lemma 3.5. So suppose that $N > 2$ and consider

$$p = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i)\right]$$

where $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N > 0$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ are distinct. We claim that

$$H_\Omega(p, \rho(\Gamma) \cdot p_0) \leq 2C_{\lceil N/2 \rceil} + R$$

where R is the constant from Lemma 3.5.

If $N = 3$ let

$$p_1 = \left[\lambda_1 \widetilde{\xi}(x_1) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_2 \widetilde{\xi}(x_2)\right]$$

and

$$p_2 = \left[\frac{1}{2}\lambda_2 \widetilde{\xi}(x_2) + \lambda_3 \widetilde{\xi}(x_3)\right].$$

Otherwise, let

$$p_1 = \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq N/2} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i)\right]$$

and

$$p_2 = \left[\sum_{N/2 < i \leq N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i)\right].$$

In either case, by induction there exists elements $g_1, g_2 \in \Gamma$ so that

$$H_\Omega(p_i, \rho(g_i) \cdot p_0) \leq C_{\lceil N/2 \rceil}.$$

Now $p \in [p_1, p_2]$ and so by Lemma 2.7 we have

$$H_\Omega(p, [\rho(g_1) \cdot p_0, \rho(g_2) \cdot p_0]) \leq 2C_{\lceil N/2 \rceil}.$$

Now let $q \in [\rho(g_1) \cdot p_0, \rho(g_2) \cdot p_0]$ be such that

$$H_\Omega(p, q) \leq 2C_{\lceil N/2 \rceil}.$$

Now if $R > 0$ is the constant in Lemma 3.5, then

$$H_\Omega(q, \rho(\Gamma) \cdot p_0) \leq R.$$

Hence

$$H_\Omega(p, \rho(\Gamma) \cdot p_0) \leq 2C_{\lceil N/2 \rceil} + R.$$

□

Next let $\mathcal{C}$ be the closed convex hull of $\xi(\partial\Gamma)$ in Ω.

Lemma 3.7. *With the notation above, $\rho(\Gamma)$ acts cocompactly on $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. By Carathéodory's convex hull theorem any $p \in \mathcal{C}$ can be written as

$$p = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\xi}(x_i) \right]$$

where $2 \leq N \leq d+1$; $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N > 0$; and $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ are distinct. Thus by the previous lemma there exists a $M > 0$ so that

$$\mathcal{C} = \cup_{g \in \Gamma} \rho(g)(B_\Omega(p_0; M) \cap \mathcal{C})$$

where $B_\Omega(p_0; M)$ is the closed metric ball of radius M in (Ω, H_Ω). □

Lemma 3.8. *With the notation above, if $f \in \overline{\Omega^*}$ then there exists $1 \leq N \leq d+1$; $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N > 0$; and $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct so that*

$$f = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\eta}(x_i) \right].$$

Proof. By the definition of Ω, the set $\overline{\Omega^*}$ is the image of

$$\overline{\text{ConvexHull}\left\{\widetilde{\eta}(x) : x \in \partial\Gamma\right\}} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d*}$$

in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$. Then since $\widetilde{\eta} : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}^{d*}$ is continuous, Carathéodory's convex hull theorem implies that f can be written as

$$f = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\eta}(x_i) \right]$$

for some $1 \leq N \leq d+1$; $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N > 0$; and $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$. □

Lemma 3.9. *With the notation above,*

$$\xi(\partial\Gamma) = \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega,$$

every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 extreme point of Ω, and

$$T_{\xi(x)}\partial\Omega = \ker \eta(x)$$

for all $x \in \partial\Gamma$.

Proof. Lemma 3.3 and the definition of $\mathcal{C}$ implies that

$$\xi(\partial\Gamma) = \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega.$$

So suppose that $x \in \partial\Gamma$. We first show that $\xi(x)$ is a C^1 point of Ω. Suppose that H is a tangent hyperplane of Ω at $\xi(x)$. Then $H = \ker f$ for some $f \in \overline{\Omega^*}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.8

$$f = \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\eta}(x_i)\right]$$

for some $1 \leq N \leq d+1$; $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_N > 0$; and $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct. Since $f(\xi(x)) = 0$, we then have

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i \widetilde{\eta}(x_i)\left(\widetilde{\xi}(x)\right).$$

Then our hypothesis on $\widetilde{\xi}$ and $\widetilde{\eta}$ imply that $N = 1$ and $x_1 = x$. Thus $f = \eta(x)$ and $H = \ker \eta(x)$. Since H was an arbitrary tangent hyperplane of Ω at $\xi(x)$ we see that $\xi(x)$ is a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$ and

$$T_{\xi(x)}\partial\Omega = \ker \eta(x).$$

We next show that $\xi(x)$ is an extreme point of Ω. This follows immediately from Lemma 5.2 below, but we will provide a direct argument. Fix a point $c_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ and consider a sequence of points q_n along the line $[c_0, \xi(x))$ which converge to $\xi(x)$. Then there exists some $M > 0$ and elements $\gamma_n \in \Gamma$ so that

$$H_\Omega(\rho(\gamma_n)c_0, q_n) \leq M.$$

Next let $k_n = \rho(\gamma_n)^{-1}q_n$. Then

$$H_\Omega(c_0, k_n) \leq M$$

and since the Hilbert metric is proper, we can pass to a subsequence so that $k_n \to k$. Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} H_\Omega(\rho(\gamma_n)k, \rho(\gamma_n)k_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} H_\Omega(k, k_n) = 0$$

which implies from the definition of the Hilbert metric that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \rho(\gamma_n)k = \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho(\gamma_n)k_n = \xi(x).$$

Next view $\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ as a subset of $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and pass to a subsequence so that $\rho(\gamma_n)$ converges to some T in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$. By Lemma 2.9, T has image $\xi(x^+)$ and kernel $\ker \eta(x^-)$ for some $x^+, x^- \in \partial\Gamma$. Since $\ker \eta(x^-) \cap \Omega = \emptyset$ (by the definition of Ω) we see that

$$\xi(x^+) = T(k) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho(\gamma_n)(k) = \xi(x)$$

and so $x^+ = x$.

Finally suppose for a contradiction that $\xi(x)$ is not an extreme point of Ω. Then there exists a point $p \in \partial\Omega$ so that $\xi(x), p$ are contained in an open line segment in $\partial\Omega$. Now by convexity we can select a sequence of points p_n along the line $[c_0, p)$ so that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} H_\Omega(p_n, q_n) = d < \infty.$$

So if $\ell_n = \rho(\gamma_n)^{-1} p_n$ then

$$H_\Omega(c_0, \ell_n) \leq M + d.$$

Since the Hilbert metric is proper, we can pass to a subsequence so that $\ell_n \to \ell$. Then arguing as above, we see that $\rho(\gamma_n)(\ell) \to p$. But then since $\ell \notin \ker \eta(x^-) = \ker T$ we have

$$T(\ell) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \rho(\gamma_n)(\ell) = p$$

which contradicts the fact that the image of T is $\xi(x)$. Thus $\xi(x)$ is an extreme point of Ω.

□

4. Basic properties of convex cocompact actions

In this section we establish some basic properties of convex cocompact actions on properly convex domains.

4.1. **Quasi-isometries.**

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete convex cocompact group. Then Λ is finitely generated and for any $p_0 \in \Omega$ the map*

$$\varphi \in \Lambda \to \varphi p_0$$

induces an quasi-isometric embedding $\Lambda \to (\Omega, H_\Omega)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$ be a closed convex subset so that Λ preserves $\mathcal{C}$ and acts cocompactly on $\mathcal{C}$. Now $(\mathcal{C}, H_\Omega)$ is a complete geodesic metric space. Since Λ acts cocompactly and by isometries on $(\mathcal{C}, H_\Omega)$, the fundamental lemma of geometric group theory says that Λ is finitely generated and for any $p_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ the map

$$\varphi \in \Lambda \to \varphi p_0$$

induces an quasi-isometric embedding $\Lambda \to (\mathcal{C}, H_\Omega)$.

Now for any $p_0, q_0 \in \Omega$ and $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \Lambda$ we have

$$|H_\Omega(\varphi_1 p_0, \varphi_2 p_0) - H_\Omega(\varphi_1 q_0, \varphi_2 q_0)| \leq 2H_\Omega(p_0, q_0).$$

So for any $q_0 \in \Omega$ the map

$$\varphi \in \Lambda \to \varphi q_0$$

induces an quasi-isometric embedding $\Lambda \to (\Omega, H_\Omega)$. □

4.2. **Rescaling.**

Given a finite dimensional real vector space V let $\mathbb{X}(V)$ denote the space of properly convex domains in $\mathbb{P}(V)$ endowed with the Hausdorff topology (with respect to a distance on $\mathbb{P}(V)$ induced by a Riemannian metric). In the 1960's Benzécri proved the following theorem:

Theorem 4.2 (Benzécri's theorem)**.** *The group $\mathrm{PGL}(V)$ acts properly and cocompactly on $\mathbb{X}(V)$. Moreover, if $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ is a properly convex domain and $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ acts cocompactly on Ω, then $\mathrm{PGL}(V) \cdot \Omega$ is closed in $\mathbb{X}(V)$.*

In this section we will use a result of Benoist to prove an analogue of Benzécri's theorem for convex cocompact actions:

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is properly convex domain, $G \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a subgroup, and there exists a closed convex subset $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$ so that $g\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}$ for all $g \in G$ and $G\backslash\mathcal{C}$ is compact. Assume $V \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a subspace that intersects $\mathcal{C}$, $c_n \in \mathcal{C} \cap V$, and $h_n \in \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ are so that*

1. *$h_n(\Omega \cap V) \to \Omega_V$ where Ω_V is a properly convex domain in $\mathbb{P}(V)$,*
2. *$h_n(\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap V) \to \mathcal{C}_V$ where $\mathcal{C}_V$ is a properly convex closed set in $\mathbb{P}(V)$,*
3. *$h_n(c_n) \to p_\infty \in \Omega_V$.*

Then there exists some $\varphi \in \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ so that

$$\varphi(\Omega) \cap V = \Omega_V$$

and

$$\varphi(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap V \supset \mathcal{C}_V\,.$$

Before starting the proof of the theorem we make one observation about the Hausdorff topology:

Observation 4.4. Suppose $\Omega_n \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a sequence of properly convex domains converging to a properly convex domain Ω.

1. If $V \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a subspace and $V \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$, then $\Omega_n \cap V \to \Omega \cap V$,
2. If $V \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a subspace so that $\overline{\Omega}_n \cap V$ converges to a closed convex set $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{C} \subset \overline{\Omega} \cap V$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.8 in [Ben03] there exists $g_n \in \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ so that $g_n|_V = h_n$ and a properly convex domain $\Omega' \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that

$$\Omega_n := g_n\Omega \to \Omega'$$

and

$$\Omega' \cap V = \Omega_V.$$

Now fix a point $p_0 \in \mathcal{C}$. Then there exists $R \geq 0$ and a sequence $\gamma_n \in G$ so that

$$H_\Omega(c_n, \gamma_n p_0) \leq R.$$

Next consider the element $\varphi_n = g_n\gamma_n$. Note that

$$H_{\Omega_n}(\varphi_n p_0, g_n c_n) = H_\Omega(\gamma_n p_0, c_n) \leq R.$$

Then since $g_n c_n \to p_\infty \in \Omega'$, and H_{Ω_n} converges locally uniformly to $H_{\Omega'}$ we can pass to a subsequence so that $\varphi_n p_0 \to q_\infty \in \Omega'$.

Then $\varphi_n(\Omega, p_0) \to (\Omega', q_\infty)$ and since $\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ acts properly on the space of properly convex domains, we can pass to a subsequence to that $\varphi_n \to \varphi \in \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$.

Then by the observation

$$\varphi(\Omega) \cap V = \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi_n(\Omega) \cap V = \lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(\Omega) \cap V = \Omega' \cap V = \Omega_V$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap V &\supset \lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi_n(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap V = \lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap V \supset \lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap V) \cap V \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} g_n(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap V \supset \lim_{n\to\infty} h_n(\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap V) \cap V = \lim_{n\to\infty} h_n(\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap V) = \mathcal{C}_V\,.\end{aligned}$$

□

5. Regular convex cocompact implies projective Anosov

In this section we prove Theorem 1.21 from the introduction. The proof uses many ideas from Benoist's work on the Hilbert metric [Ben03, Ben04].

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is a properly convex domain and $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete convex cocompact subgroup. Let $\mathcal{C}$ is be a closed convex subset of Ω so that $g\,\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}$ for all $g \in \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \backslash \mathcal{C}$ is compact. If Λ is an irreducible subgroup of $\mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, then the following are equivalent:*

1. *every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$,*
2. *every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is an extreme point of $\partial\Omega$*

Moreover, when these conditions are satisfied Λ is word hyperbolic and the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is projective Anosov.

For the rest of the section fix a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, a discrete convex cocompact subgroup $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$, and a closed convex subset $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$ which satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 5.1.

Since Λ preserves the subspace

$$V = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} \{c : c \in \mathcal{C}\},$$

we see that $\mathcal{C}$ has non-empty interior.

Lemma 5.2. *With the notation above, if each $q \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$, then each $q \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is an extreme point of Ω.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a point $q \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ which is not an extreme point of Ω. Then after making a change of coordinates we can assume the following:

1. $[1 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$,
2. $[1 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathcal{C}$,
3. $\Omega \subset \{[1 : x_1 : x_2 : \cdots : x_{d-1}] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_2 > 0\}$, and
4. $\{[1 : t : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : t \in [-1, 1]\} \subset \partial\Omega$.

Now let

$$V = \{[x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

$c_n = \left[1 : 0 : \frac{1}{n} : 0 : \cdots : 0\right] \in \mathcal{C} \cap V$, and $h_n \in \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ be given by

$$h_n[x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : 0 : \cdots : 0] = [x_1 : x_2 : nx_3 : 0 : \cdots : 0].$$

Then $h_n c_n \to [1 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$,

$h_n(\Omega \cap V) \to \Omega_V := \{[1 : s : t : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : [1 : s : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \partial\Omega \text{ and } t > 0\}$,

and

$h_n(\mathcal{C} \cap V) \to \mathcal{C}_V := \{[1 : s : t : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : [1 : s : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}} \text{ and } t > 0\}$.

Clearly Ω_V is properly convex and so by Theorem 4.3, there exists some $\varphi \in \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\varphi(\Omega) \cap V = \Omega_V$ and $\varphi(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap V \supset \mathcal{C}_V$. But

$$[0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \partial\Omega_V \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}_V}$$

is a not a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega_V$ and hence is not a C^1 point of $\partial(\varphi(\Omega))$. But then

$$\varphi^{-1}[0 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$$

is not a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$ and we have a contradiction. □

Lemma 5.3. *With the notation above, if each $q \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is an extreme point of Ω, then each $q \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$.*

Proof. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a point $q \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ which is not a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$. Then there exists two different hyperplanes H_1, H_2 so that $q \in H_1 \cap H_2$ and $H_1 \cap \Omega = H_2 \cap \Omega = \emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ has non-empty interior, there exists a two dimensional subspace $V \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ so that V intersects the interior of $\mathcal{C}$, and $V \cap H_1 \neq V \cap H_2$.

By making a change of coordinates, we can assume that

(1) $q = [1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$,
(2) $V = \{[x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}$,
(3) $\Omega \cap V \subset \{[1 : x_1 : x_2 : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : x_2 > 0\}$,
(4) $[1 : 0 : 1 : \cdots : 0]$ is contained in the interior of $\mathcal{C}$, and
(5) there exists $\alpha_1 < 0 < \alpha_2$ so that

$$H_i \cap V = \{[1 : t : \alpha_i t : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Now since $[1 : 0 : 1 : \cdots : 0]$ is contained in the interior of $\mathcal{C}$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ and $\beta_1 < 0 < \beta_2$ so that

$$\{[1 : t : \beta_2 t : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : 0 < t < \epsilon\} \subset \mathcal{C}$$

and

$$\{[1 : t : \beta_1 t : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : -\epsilon < t < 0\} \subset \mathcal{C}\,.$$

Next consider the points $c_n = [1 : 0 : \frac{1}{n} : 0 : \cdots : 0]$ and let $h_n \in \mathrm{PGL}(V)$ be given by

$$h_n[x_1 : x_2 : x_3 : 0 : \cdots : 0] = [x_1 : nx_2 : nx_3 : 0 : \cdots : 0]\,.$$

Then $h_n c_n \to [1 : 0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0]$, $h_n(\Omega \cap V)$ converges to the tangent cone $\mathcal{TC}_q(\Omega \cap V)$ of $\Omega \cap V$ at q, and $h_n(\mathcal{C} \cap V)$ converges to the tangent cone $\mathcal{TC}_q(\mathcal{C} \cap V)$ of $\mathcal{C} \cap V$ at q.

By construction $\mathcal{TC}_q(\Omega \cap V)$ is a properly convex domain in V. So by Theorem 4.3, there exists some $\varphi \in \mathrm{PGL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ so that $\varphi(\Omega) \cap V = \mathcal{TC}_g(\Omega \cap V)$ and $\varphi(\overline{\mathcal{C}}) \cap V \supset \overline{\mathcal{TC}_g(\mathcal{C} \cap V)}$. But then

$$\varphi^{-1}\{[0 : 1 : s : 0 : \cdots : 0] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) : \beta_1 \leq s \leq \beta_2\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$$

which contradicts the fact that every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is an extreme point. □

For the remainder of the section we assume, in addition, that

(1) every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$ and
(2) every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is an extreme point of $\partial\Omega$.

Lemma 5.4. *With the notation above, Λ is word hyperbolic.*

Proof. Fix a finite symmetric generating set S of Λ. By Proposition 4.1, (Λ, d_S) is quasi-isometric to $(\mathcal{C}, H_\Omega)$ and so it is enough to show that $(\mathcal{C}, H_\Omega)$ is Gromov hyperbolic. Now for each $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ let $\sigma_{x,y}$ be the straight-line geodesic segment joining x to y. By Lemma 2.2 it is enough to show that there exists $\delta > 0$ so that every geodesic triangle in $(\mathcal{C}, H_\Omega)$ of the form $\sigma_{x,y}, \sigma_{y,z}, \sigma_{z,x}$ is δ-thin. So suppose

for a contradiction that such a $\delta > 0$ does not exist. Then for every $n > 0$ there exists points $x_n, y_n, z_n, u_n \in \mathcal{C}$ so that $u_n \in \sigma_{x_n,y_n}$ and

$$H_\Omega(u_n, \sigma_{y_n,z_n} \cup \sigma_{z_n,x_n}) > n.$$

By replacing the the points x_n, y_n, z_n, u_n by $g_n x_n, g_n y_n, g_n z_n, g_n u_n$ for some $g_n \in \Lambda$ we can assume that the sequence u_n is relatively compact in $\mathcal{C}$. Then by passing to a subsequence we can suppose that $u_n \to u \in \mathcal{C}$. By passing to another subsequence we can assume that $x_n, y_n, z_n \to x, y, z \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}$. Since

$$H_\Omega(u_n, \{x_n, y_n, z_n\}) > n$$

we must have $x, y, z \in \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$. The image of σ_{x_n,y_n} converges to a line segment containing x, y, u. Since $u \in \mathcal{C}$ and $x, y \in \partial\Omega$ we must have $x \neq y$. Then either $z \neq x$ or $z \neq y$. By relabeling we may assume that $z \neq x$. Then the image of σ_{x_n,z_n} converges to the line segment $[x, z]$ and since $(x, z) \subset \Omega$ we see that

$$\infty = \lim_{n\to\infty} H_\Omega(u_n, \sigma_{z_n,x_n}) = H_\Omega(u, (x, z)) < \infty.$$

So we have a contradiction and hence Λ is word hyperbolic. □

Lemma 5.5. *With the notation above, there exists a Λ-equivariant homeomorphism $\xi : \partial\Lambda \to \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$.*

Proof. Since every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is an extreme point, this follows from Lemma 2.8. □

Lemma 5.6. *With the notation above, the inclusion representation $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is projective Anosov.*

Proof. Let $\xi : \partial\Lambda \to \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ be the Λ-equivariant homeomorphism from the previous lemma. Since every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 point, the map $\eta : \partial\Lambda \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d*})$ given by

$$\ker \eta(x) = T_{\xi(x)}\partial\Omega$$

is well defined, continuous, and Λ-equivariant. Now since each $q \in \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is an extreme point of $\partial\Omega$ we see that

$$\xi(x) + \ker \eta(y) = \mathbb{R}^d$$

for $x, y \in \partial\Gamma$ distinct. Then Proposition 4.10 in [GW12] implies that the inclusion representation is projective Anosov.

□

6. Proof of Theorem 1.10

We now prove Theorem 1.10 from the introduction:

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose G is a semisimple Lie group with finite center and $P \leq G$ is a parabolic subgroup. Then there exists a finite dimensional real vector space V and an irreducible representation $\phi : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ with the following property: if Γ is a word hyperbolic group and $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is a Zariski dense representation with finite kernel, then the following are equivalent:*

1. *ρ is P-Anosov,*
2. *there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ so that $(\phi \circ \rho)(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.*

For the rest of the section fix G a semisimple Lie group with finite center and $P \leq G$ a parabolic subgroup.

By Theorem 1.15, there exists a finite dimensional real vector space V_0 and an irreducible representation $\phi_0 : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V_0)$ with the following property: if Γ is a word hyperbolic group and $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is a Zariski dense representation with finite kernel, then the following are equivalent:

(1) ρ is P-Anosov,
(2) $\phi_0 \circ \rho$ is projective Anosov.

For a proximal element $g \in \mathrm{PSL}(V_0)$ let $\ell_g^+ \in \mathbb{P}(V_0)$ be the eigenline of g corresponding to the eigenvalue of largest absolute value. Then consider the vector space

$$V = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{\ell_g^+ \otimes \ell_g^+ : g \in \phi_0(G) \text{ is proximal}\}$$

and the induced representation $\phi : G \to \mathrm{SL}(V)$ given by

$$\phi(g)(v \otimes v) = (\phi_0(g)v) \otimes (\phi_0(g)v).$$

Notice that we can assume that $V \neq (0)$, for otherwise there is nothing to prove.

Lemma 6.2. *With the notation above, $\phi : G \to \mathrm{SL}(V)$ is an irreducible representation.*

Proof. Since $\phi_0 : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V_0)$ is irreducible, $\phi_0(G)$ acts minimally on the set

$$\{\ell_g^+ : g \in \phi_0(G) \text{ is proximal}\} \subset \mathbb{P}(V_0),$$

see for instance [Ben00, Lemma 2.5]. So $\phi(G)$ acts minimally on the set

$$\{\ell_g^+ \otimes \ell_g^+ : g \in \phi_0(G) \text{ is proximal}\} \subset \mathbb{P}(V).$$

Since G is semsimple, we can decompose $V = \oplus_{i=1}^m W_i$ where each $W_i \leq V$ is $\phi(G)$-invariant and the induced representation $G \to \mathrm{PSL}(W_i)$ is irreducible. Now fix some $h \in G$ so that $\phi_0(h)$ is proximal. Then $\phi(h) \leq \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is proximal. Then viewing $\mathrm{PSL}(V)$ as a subset of $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(V))$, we can find a sequence $n_k \to \infty$ so that $\phi(h)^{n_k} \to T$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(V))$. Since $\phi(h)$ is proximal, using the Jordan normal form, it is easy to see that the image of T is $\ell_h^+ \otimes \ell_h^+$. By relabeling the W_i, we can suppose that there exists some element $w \in W_1 \setminus \ker T$. Then

$$\ell_h^+ \otimes \ell_h^+ = T([w]) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \phi(h)^{n_k}[w] \subset W_1.$$

Then since $\phi(G)$ acts minimally on the set

$$\{\ell_g^+ \otimes \ell_g^+ : g \in \phi_0(G) \text{ is proximal}\}$$

we see that $W_1 = V$. Hence $\phi : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is an irreducible representation. □

We now complete the proof of the theorem:

Lemma 6.3. *With the notation above, if Γ is a word hyperbolic group and $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is a Zariski dense representation with finite kernel, then the following are equivalent:*

(1) *ρ is P-Anosov,*
(2) *there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ so that $(\phi \circ \rho)(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. If ρ is P-Anosov, then $\phi_0 \circ \rho$ is projective Anosov representation by our choice of ϕ_0. Then by Corollary 1.29 there exists a subspace $V' \subset V$ and a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V')$ so that $(\phi \circ \rho)(\Gamma)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$. Since $\phi : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is irreducible and $\rho(\Gamma) \leq G$ is Zariski dense, we see that $\phi \circ \rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is irreducible. Hence $V' = V$.

Next suppose that there exists some properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$ so that $(\phi \circ \rho)(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup. Since $\phi : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is irreducible and $\rho(\Gamma) \leq G$ is Zariski dense, we see that $\phi \circ \rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}(V)$ is irreducible. Hence Theorem 5.1 implies that $\phi \circ \rho$ is a projective Anosov representation. Let $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(V)$ and $\eta : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(V^*)$ be the associated boundary maps.

We claim that there exists maps $\xi_0 : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(V_0)$ and $\eta_0 : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(V_0^*)$ so that

$$\xi(x) = \xi_0(x) \otimes \xi_0(x)$$

and

$$\eta(x) = \eta_0(x) \otimes \eta_0(x)$$

for all $x \in \partial\Gamma$. Since $\rho(\Gamma)$ is Zariski dense in G and $\phi(G)$ contains proximal elements, there exists some $\varphi \in \Gamma$ so that $(\phi_0 \circ \rho)(\varphi)$ is proximal, see for instance [Pra94]. Let $x^+ \in \partial\Gamma$ be the attracting fixed point of φ in $\partial\Gamma$. Then $\xi(x^+)$ is the eigenline of $(\phi \circ \rho)(\varphi)$ whose eigenvalue has maximal absolute value. Since

$$(\phi \circ \rho)(\varphi) = (\phi_0 \circ \rho)(\varphi) \otimes (\phi_0 \circ \rho)(\varphi)$$

and $(\phi_0 \circ \rho)(\varphi)$ is proximal we then see that

$$\xi(x^+) = \ell^+ \otimes \ell^+$$

where ℓ^+ is the eigenline of $(\phi_0 \circ \rho)(\varphi)$ whose eigenvalue has maximal absolute value. Now

(1) $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(V)$ is continuous and $(\phi \circ \rho)$-equivariant,
(2) the set

$$\{[v \otimes v] : v \in V_0 \setminus \{0\}\} \subset \mathbb{P}(V)$$

is closed and $\phi(G)$-invariant, and
(3) the set $\Gamma \cdot x^+$ is dense in $\partial\Gamma$.

Hence there exists a map $\xi_0 : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(V_0)$ so that

$$\xi(x) = \xi_0(x) \otimes \xi_0(x)$$

for all $x \in \partial\Gamma$. The same argument applied to η implies that there exists a map $\eta_0 : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(V_0^*)$ so that

$$\eta(x) = \eta_0(x) \otimes \eta_0(x)$$

for all $x \in \partial\Gamma$.

Finally, it is easy to see that the maps ξ_0, η_0 are continuous, $(\phi_0 \circ \rho)$-equivariant, dynamics preserving, and transverse. Moreover, since the representation $\phi_0 : G \to \mathrm{PSL}(V_0)$ is irreducible and $\rho(\Gamma) \leq G$ is Zariski dense, we see that $\phi_0 \circ \rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}(V_0)$ is irreducible. Hence by Proposition 4.10 in [GW12] we see that $\phi_0 \circ \rho : \Gamma \to G$ is a projective Anosov representation. Thus by our choice of ϕ_0 we see that $\rho : \Gamma \to G$ is P-Anosov.

□

7. Entropy rigidity

The proof of Theorem 1.34 has three steps: first we use results of Coornaert-Knieper, Coornaert, and Cooper-Long-Tillmann to transfer to the Hilbert metric setting, then we use a result of Tholozan to transfer to the Riemmanian metric setting, and finally we use an argument of Liu to prove rigidity. This general approach is based on the arguments in [BMZ15].

It will also be more convenient in this section to work with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ instead of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

7.1. **Some notation.** Suppose (X, d) is a proper metric space and $x_0 \in X$ is some point. If $G \leq \mathrm{Isom}(X, d)$ is a discrete subgroup, then define the *Poincaré exponent of* G to be

$$\delta_G(X, d) := \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{r} \log \#\left\{g \in G : d(x_0, gx_0) \leq r\right\}.$$

If X has a measure μ one can also define the *volume growth entropy relative to* μ as

$$h_{vol}(X, d, \mu) := \limsup_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{r} \log \mu\left(\{x \in X : d(x, x_0) \leq r\}\right).$$

If the measure μ is $\mathrm{Isom}(X, d)$-invariant, finite on bounded sets, and positive on open sets then

$$\delta_G(X, d) \leq h_{vol}(X, d, \mu).$$

In the case in which (X, g) is a Riemannian manifold with induced distance d, we will let

$$h_{vol}(X, g) := h_{vol}(X, d, \mathrm{Vol})$$

where Vol is the Riemannian volume.

7.2. **Transferring to the Hilbert metric setting.** By combining results of Coornaert-Knieper, Coornaert, and Cooper-Long-Tillmann, we can establish the following:

Proposition 7.1. *Suppose Γ is a word hyperbolic group, $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ is an projective Anosov representation, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is properly convex domain so that $\rho(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup. Then*

$$H_\rho = \delta_{\rho(\Gamma)}(\Omega, H_\Omega).$$

Moreover, for any $p_0 \in \Omega$ there exists $C \geq 1$ so that

$$\frac{1}{C} e^{H_\rho r} \leq \#\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma : H_\Omega(p_0, \rho(\gamma)p_0) \leq r\right\} \leq C e^{H_\rho r}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$ be a closed convex subset so that $g\,\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}$ for all $g \in \rho(\Gamma)$, $\rho(\Gamma)\backslash\mathcal{C}$ is compact, and every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 extreme point of Ω.

Using Selberg's lemma, we can find a finite index subgroup $\Gamma_0 \leq \Gamma$ so that $\rho(\Gamma_0)$ is torsion free. Then $H_\rho = H_{\rho|_{\Gamma_0}}$, $\delta_{\rho(\Gamma_0)}(\Omega, H_\Omega) = \delta_{\rho(\Gamma)}(\Omega, H_\Omega)$, and $\rho(\Gamma_0)\backslash\mathcal{C}$ is compact.

For $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$ define

$$\tau(\gamma) = \inf_{c\in\mathcal{C}} H_\Omega(\rho(\gamma)c, c).$$

Since $(\mathcal{C}, H_\Omega)$ is a proper geodesic metric space, $\rho(\Gamma_0)$ acts cocompactly on $\mathcal{C}$, Γ_0 is word hyperbolic, and $\ker \rho$ is finite, Theorem 1.1 in [CK02] shows that

$$\delta_{\rho(\Gamma_0)}(\Omega, H_\Omega) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{r} \log \# \left\{ [\gamma] \in [\Gamma_0] : \tau(\gamma) \leq r \right\}.$$

Next we claim that

$$\tau(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{d+1}(\rho(\gamma))} \right)$$

for every $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$. Fix some $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$. Then Proposition 2.1 in [CLT15] says that

$$\inf_{x\in\Omega} H_\Omega(\rho(\gamma)x, x) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{d+1}(\rho(\gamma))} \right).$$

and so

$$\tau(\gamma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{d+1}(\rho(\gamma))} \right).$$

Since $\rho_0(\gamma)$ has infinite order we see that $\rho_0(\gamma)$ is biproximal. So if x^+ and x^- are the attracting and repelling eigenlines of $\rho_0(\gamma)$, then Corollary 2.10 implies that $x^+, x^- \in \overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$. Since every point in $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \cap \partial\Omega$ is a C^1 extreme point of Ω, we then see that $(x^+, x^-) \subset \mathcal{C}$. But if $x \in (x^+, x^-)$ then a simple calculation shows that

$$H_\Omega(\rho_0(\gamma)x, x) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{d+1}(\rho(\gamma))} \right).$$

Hence

$$\tau(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{d+1}(\rho(\gamma))} \right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\rho(\Gamma_0)}(\Omega, H_\Omega) &= \lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{r} \log \# \left\{ [\gamma] \in [\Gamma_0] : \tau(\gamma) \leq r \right\} \\ &= \lim_{r\to\infty} \frac{1}{r} \log \# \left\{ [\gamma] \in [\Gamma_0] : \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{d+1}(\rho(\gamma))} \right) \leq r \right\} = H_{\rho|_{\Gamma_0}} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$H_\rho = H_{\rho|_{\Gamma_0}} = \delta_{\rho(\Gamma_0)}(\Omega, H_\Omega) = \delta_{\rho(\Gamma)}(\Omega, H_\Omega).$$

Finally by Théorème 7.2 in [Coo93], for any $p_0 \in \Omega$ there exists $C \geq 1$ so that

$$\frac{1}{C} e^{H_\rho r} \leq \# \left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma : H_\Omega(p_0, \rho(\gamma)p_0) \leq r \right\} \leq C e^{H_\rho r}.$$

□

7.3. **Transferring to the Riemannian setting.** Associated to every properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is a Riemannian distance B_Ω on Ω called the *Blaschke distance* (see, for instance, [Lof01, BH13]). This Riemannian distance is $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$-invariant and by a result of Calabi [Cal72] has Ricci curvature bounded below by $-(d-1)$. Since the Ricci curvature is bounded below by $-(d-1)$, the Bishop-Gromov volume comparison theorem implies that

$$h_{vol}(\Omega, B_\Omega) \leq d - 1.$$

Benzécri's theorem (see Theorem 4.2) provides a simple proof that the Hilbert distance and the Blaschke distance are bi-Lipschitz (see for instance [Mar14b, Section 9.2]), but Tholozan recently proved the following refined relationship between the two distances:

Theorem 7.2. [Tho15] *If $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ is a properly convex domain, then*

$$B_\Omega < H_\Omega + 1.$$

In particular, if $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a discrete group, then

$$\delta_\Gamma(\Omega, H_\Omega) \leq \delta_\Gamma(\Omega, B_\Omega) \leq h_{vol}(\Omega, B_\Omega) \leq d-1.$$

7.4. **Rigidity in the Riemannian setting.** In the case when (X, g) is a Riemannian d-manifold with $\mathrm{Ric} \geq -(d-1)$, the Bishop-Gromov volume comparison theorem implies that

$$h_{vol}(X, g) \leq d-1.$$

In particular, amongst the class of Riemannian d-manifolds with $\mathrm{Ric} \geq -(d-1)$ the volume growth entropy is maximized when (X, g) is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space. There are many other examples which maximize volume growth entropy, but if X has "enough" symmetry then it is reasonable to suspect that $h_{vol}(X, g) = d-1$ if and only if X is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space. This was proved by Ledrappier and Wang when X covers a compact manifold:

Theorem 7.3 (Ledrappier-Wang [LW10])**.** *Let (X, g) be a complete simply connected Riemannian d-manifold with $\mathrm{Ric} \geq -(d-1)$. Suppose that X is the Riemannian universal cover of a compact manifold. Then $h_{vol}(X, g) = d-1$ if and only if X is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space.*

Later Liu [Liu11] provided a simpler proof of Ledrappier and Wang's result and Liu's argument can be used essentially verbatim to prove the following:

Proposition 7.4. *Let (X, g) be a complete simply connected Riemannian manifold d-manifold with $\mathrm{Ric} \geq -(d-1)$ and bounded sectional curvature. Suppose $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Isom}(X, g)$ is a discrete subgroup and there exists $C > 0$ and $x_0 \in X$ so that*

$$Ce^{(d-1)r} \leq \#\{\gamma \in \Gamma : d_X(x_0, \gamma x_0) \leq r\}.$$

Then X is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space.

We will prove this result in the appendix.

7.5. **Proof of Theorem 1.34.** Suppose Γ is a finitely generated word hyperbolic group, $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_{d+1}(\mathbb{R})$ is a projective Anosov representation, and $\rho(\Gamma)$ preserves a properly convex domain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$. Using Theorem 1.26, there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ so that $\rho(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup.

Combining Proposition 7.1 and Theorem 7.2 we see that

$$H_\rho = \delta_{\rho(\Gamma)}(\Omega, H_\Omega) \leq d-1.$$

Now suppose that $H_\rho = d-1$. By Theorem 7.2 and Proposition 7.1 there exists some $C_0 > 0$ so that

$$C_0 e^{(d-1)r} \leq \#\left\{\gamma \in \Gamma : B_\Omega(p_0, \rho(\gamma)p_0) \leq r\right\}$$

for all $r \geq 0$. Moreover, using Benzécri's theorem it is easy to see that B_Ω has bounded sectional curvature (see for instance [BMZ15, Lemma 3.1]). So by Proposition 7.4, (Ω, B_Ω) is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space. This implies that (Ω, H_Ω) is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space and hence $\rho(\Gamma)$ is a convex cocompact subgroup of $\mathrm{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^d_{\mathbb{R}})$ in the classical sense. However, since

$$\delta_{\rho(\Gamma)}(\Omega, H_\Omega) = d - 1$$

we see that the Hausdorff dimension of $\partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is $d-1$. This implies that

$$\partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}} = \partial\Omega.$$

Then since $\mathcal{C}$ is convex we see that $\mathcal{C} = \Omega$. Then since $\rho(\Gamma)\backslash\mathcal{C}$ is compact, we see that $\rho(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a co-compact lattice. Since $\mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is conjugate to $\mathrm{PO}(1,d)$ the theorem is established.

8. Regularity rigidity

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.45 from the introduction.

Theorem 8.1. *Suppose $d > 2$, Γ is a word hyperbolic group, and $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is an irreducible projective Anosov representation with boundary map $\xi : \partial\Gamma \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. If*

1. *$M = \xi(\partial\Gamma)$ is a C^2 k-dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and*
2. *the representation $\wedge^{k+1}\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ is irreducible,*

then

$$\frac{\lambda_1(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_2(\rho(\gamma))} = \frac{\lambda_{k+1}(\rho(\gamma))}{\lambda_{k+2}(\rho(\gamma))}$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

The proof of Theorem 8.1 is based on the following observation:

Observation 8.2. Suppose $g \in \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is proximal and $d_{\mathbb{P}}$ is a distance on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ induced by a Riemannian metric. If $v \neq \ell_g^+$ and $g^n v \to \ell_g^+$ then

$$\log\frac{\lambda_2(g)}{\lambda_1(g)} \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d_{\mathbb{P}}\Big(g^n v, \ell_g^+\Big).$$

Moreover, there exists a proper subspace $V \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that: if $v \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus V$ and $g^n v \to \ell_g^+$ then

$$\log\frac{\lambda_2(g)}{\lambda_1(g)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d_{\mathbb{P}}\Big(g^n v, \ell_g^+\Big).$$

Proof. This follows easily once g is written in Jordan normal form. □

8.1. **Proof of Theorem 8.1.** For the rest of the subsection, fix a word hyperbolic group Γ and a projective Anosov representation $\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ which satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem.

Define the map

$$\Phi : M \to \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$$

by

$$\Phi(m) = [v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{k+1}]$$

where $T_m M = [\mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{v_1, \ldots, v_{k+1}\}]$. Since M is a C^2 submanifold, Φ is a C^1 map.

Lemma 8.3. *With the notation above,* $\Phi : M \to \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ *is an* C^1 *immersion.*

Proof. We break the proof into two cases: when $k = 1$ and when $k > 1$.

Case 1: Assume $k = 1$. We first consider the case when $d(\Phi)_m = 0$ for every $m \in M$. Then there exists a two dimensional subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ so that $T_m M = [V]$ for all m. Then we must have $M \subset V$. Since ρ is irreducible, the elements in M span $\mathbb{R}^d$ and so $d \leq 2$. Thus we have a contradiction. So $d(\Phi)_{m_0} \neq 0$ for some $m_0 \in M$. But since

$$\Phi \circ \rho(\gamma) = (\wedge^2 \rho(\gamma)) \circ \Phi$$

for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and Γ acts minimally on M, we see that $d(\Phi)_m \neq 0$ for every m.

Case 2: Assume $k > 1$. Then by Theorem 1.24 there exists a properly convex domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that $\rho(\Gamma) \leq \mathrm{Aut}(\Omega)$ is a regular convex cocompact subgroup. Suppose $\mathcal{C} \subset \Omega$ is a closed convex subset so that $g\,\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}$ for all $g \in \rho(\Gamma)$, $\rho(\Gamma)\backslash\,\mathcal{C}$ is compact, and every point in $\partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a C^1 extreme point of Ω.

We first claim that Φ is injective. Now by Lemma 2.9 we have

$$\xi(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega \cap \overline{\mathcal{C}}$$

and

$$\eta(\partial\Gamma) \subset \partial\Omega^*.$$

Then since $\xi(x)$ is a C^1 point of $\partial\Omega$ we have

$$T_{\xi(x)}\partial\Omega = \ker \eta(x).$$

Further since $M \subset \partial\Omega$ we see that

$$T_{\xi(x)}M \subset T_{\xi(x)}\partial\Omega = \ker \eta(x).$$

for every $x \in \partial\Gamma$. Now suppose that $T_{\xi(x)}M = T_{\xi(y)}M$ for some $x, y \in \partial\Gamma$. Then

$$\xi(x) \in T_{\xi(x)}M = T_{\xi(y)}M \subset \ker \eta(y).$$

So $x = y$ and hence Φ is injective.

Since Φ is injective and C^1, $d(\Phi)$ has full rank on an open dense set. But since

$$\Phi \circ \rho(\gamma) = (\wedge^2 \rho(\gamma)) \circ \Phi$$

for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and Γ acts minimally on M, we see that $d(\Phi)$ has full rank everywhere. Hence, since M is compact and Φ is injective, Φ is a C^1 embedding. □

Next fix a distances d_1 on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and d_2 on $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ which are induced by Riemannian metrics. Since Φ is a C^1 immersion, there exists $C \geq 1$ so that

$$\frac{1}{C} d_1(m_1, m_2) \leq d_2(\Phi(m_1), \Phi(m_2)) \leq C d_1(m_1, m_2)$$

for all $m_1, m_2 \in M$ sufficiently close.

Now fix some $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with infinite order and suppose that

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 > \cdots \geq \lambda_d$$

are the absolute values of the eigenvalues of $\rho(\gamma)$. Then the absolute values of the eigenvalues of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ have the form

$$\lambda_{i_1}\lambda_{i_2}\cdots\lambda_{i_{k+1}}$$

for $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{k+1} \leq d$. In particular,

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{k+1}$$

is the absolute value of the largest eigenvalue of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ and

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_k \lambda_{k+2}$$

is the absolute value of the second largest eigenvalue of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$.

Next let x^+, x^- be the attracting and repelling fixed points of γ in $\partial\Gamma$.

Lemma 8.4. *With the notation above, $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ is proximal and $\Phi(\xi(x^+))$ is the eigenline of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ whose eigenvalue has absolute value $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k+1}$.*

Proof. We first claim that $\Phi(\xi(x^+))$ is the eigenline of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ whose eigenvalue has absolute value $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k+1}$.

Viewing $\mathrm{PSL}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ as a subset of $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d))$, we can find a sequence $n_m \to \infty$ so that $(\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^{n_m}$ converges to some $T \in \mathbb{P}(\mathrm{End}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d))$. Moreover, by writing $(\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^{n_m}$ in Jordan normal form, it is clear that every element in the image of T is a sum of eigenvectors of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ whose eigenvalue has maximal absolute value (that is, $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k+1}$). Moreover, if $v \in \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $v \notin \ker T$ then

$$T(v) = \lim_{m\to\infty} (\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^{n_m} v.$$

Now since $\wedge^{k+1}\rho : \Gamma \to \mathrm{PSL}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ is irreducible, the set

$$\{\Phi(m) : m \in M\}$$

spans $\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d$. Thus there exists $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \partial\Gamma$ so that

$$\Phi(\xi(x_1)), \ldots, \Phi(\xi(x_N))$$

span $\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d$. By perturbing the x_i (if necessary) we can also assume that

$$x^- \notin \{x_1, \ldots, x_N\}.$$

Next by relabelling the x_i we can also assume that there exists $1 \leq m \leq N$ so that

$$\Phi(\xi(x_1)) + \cdots + \Phi(\xi(x_m)) + \ker T = \wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d$$

and

$$\Big(\Phi(\xi(x_1)) + \cdots + \Phi(\xi(x_m))\Big) \cap \ker T = (0).$$

Then for $1 \leq i \leq m$ we have

$$T(\Phi(\xi(x_i))) = \lim_{m\to\infty} (\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^{n_m} \Phi(\xi(x_i)) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \Phi(\xi(\gamma^{n_m} x)) = \Phi(\xi(x^+)).$$

So the image of T is $\Phi(\xi(x^+))$ and hence $\Phi(\xi(x^+))$ is an eigenline of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ whose eigenvalue has absolute value $\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_{k+1}$.

We next argue that $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ is proximal. Suppose not, then by considering the Jordan normal form of $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$, there exists a proper subspace $V \subset \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d)$ so that: if $v \in \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus V$ then

$$0 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d_2\Big((\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^n v, \Phi(\xi(x_\gamma^+))\Big).$$

Since $\{\Phi(m) : m \in M\}$ spans $\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d$ there exists $x \in \partial\Gamma$ so that $\Phi(\xi(x)) \notin V$. Then by perturbing x (if necessary) we can assume that $x \neq x^-$. Then

$$\rho(\gamma)^n\xi(x) \to \xi(x^+) \text{ and } (\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^n\Phi(\xi(x)) \to \Phi(\xi(x^+)).$$

So by Observation 8.2

$$\begin{aligned}
0 > \log\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_1\Big(\rho(\gamma)^n\xi(x), \xi(x_\gamma^+)\Big)\\
&= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_1\Big(\xi(\gamma^n x), \xi(x_\gamma^+)\Big)\\
&= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_2\Big(\Phi(\xi(\gamma^n x)), \Phi(\xi(x^+))\Big)\\
&= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_2\Big((\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^n\Phi(\xi(x)), \Phi(\xi(x^+))\Big) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have a contradiction and hence $\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma)$ is proximal. □

By Observation 8.2, there exists $V_1 \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ a proper subspace so that

$$\log\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_1\Big(\rho(\gamma)^n v, \xi(x^+)\Big)$$

for all $v \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus V_1$ with $\rho(\gamma)^n v \to \xi(x^+)$. By the same observation, there exists a proper subspace $V_2 \subset \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ so that

$$\log\frac{\lambda_{k+2}}{\lambda_{k+1}} = \log\frac{\lambda_1\lambda_2\cdots\lambda_k\lambda_{k+2}}{\lambda_1\lambda_2\cdots\lambda_{k+1}} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_2\Big((\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^n w, \Phi(\xi(x_\gamma^+))\Big)$$

for all $w \in \mathbb{P}(\wedge^{k+1}\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus V_2$ with $(\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^n w \to \Phi(\xi(x_\gamma^+))$.

Since ρ is irreducible, $\{\xi(x) : x \in \partial\Gamma\}$ spans $\mathbb{R}^d$. So we can pick some $x \in \partial\Gamma$ so that $\xi(x) \notin V_1$. By perturbing x (if necessary) we can also assume that $x \neq x^-$. Then $\gamma^n x \to x^+$ and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_1\Big(\rho(\gamma)^n\xi(x), \xi(x^+)\Big) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_1\Big(\xi(\gamma^n x), \xi(x^+)\Big)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_2\Big(\Phi(\xi(\gamma^n x)), \Phi(\xi(x^+))\Big)\\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log d_2\Big((\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^n\Phi(\xi(x)), \Phi(\xi(x^+))\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Using Observation 8.2 we then have

$$\log\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} \leq \log\frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}.$$

Since $\wedge^{k+1}\rho$ is irreducible, $\{\Phi(\xi(x)) : x \in \partial\Gamma\}$ spans $\mathbb{R}^d$. So we can pick some $x \in \partial\Gamma$ so that $\Phi(\xi(x)) \notin V_2$. By perturbing x (if necessary) we can assume that

$x \neq x^-$. Then $\gamma^n x \to x^+$ and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k} &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d_2\Big((\wedge^{k+1}\rho(\gamma))^n \Phi(\xi(x)), \Phi(\xi(x^+))\Big) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d_2\Big(\Phi(\xi(\gamma^n x)), \Phi(\xi(x^+))\Big) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d_1\Big(\xi(\gamma^n x), \xi(x^+)\Big) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log d_1\Big(\rho(\gamma)^n \xi(x), \xi(x^+)\Big) \\
&\leq \log \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1} = \frac{\lambda_{k+1}}{\lambda_k}$$

and since $\gamma \in \Gamma$ was an arbitrary element with infinite order this proves the theorem.

Appendix A. An argument of Liu

In this section we show how an argument of Liu [Liu11] can be adapted to prove:

Proposition A.1. *Let (X, g) be a complete simply connected Riemannian manifold d-manifold with $\mathrm{Ric} \geq -(d-1)$ and bounded sectional curvature. Suppose $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Isom}(X, g)$ is a discrete subgroup and there exists $C > 0$ and $x_0 \in X$ so that*

$$Ce^{(d-1)r} \leq \#\{\gamma \in \Gamma : d_X(x_0, \gamma x_0) \leq r\}.$$

Then X is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space.

Remark A.2. Essentially the only change in Liu's argument is replacing the words "by a standard covering technique" with the proof of Lemma A.4 below.

Suppose for the rest of the section that (X, g) is a Riemannian manifold and $\Gamma \leq \mathrm{Isom}(X, g)$ is a discrete subgroup which satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem.

By Theorem 6 in [LW10], X is isometric to real hyperbolic space if there exists a C^∞ function $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$ so that $\|\nabla u\| \equiv 1$ and $\Delta u \equiv d-1$ (notice that $\phi = e^{(d-1)u}$ is positive, harmonic, and $\|\nabla \log(\phi)\| \equiv d-1$).

Next fix a point $x_0 \in X$ and some very large $R > 0$. Let $d_0 : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be the function $d_0(x) = d(x, x_0)$. Then d_0 is C^∞ on $X \setminus \{x_0\}$.

Lemma A.3. *With the notation above, there exists $r_n \to \infty$ so that if*

$$A_n = \{x \in X : r_n - 50R \leq d(x_0, x) \leq r_n + 50R\}$$

then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}(A_n)} \int_{A_n} \Delta d_0(x) d\,\mathrm{Vol} = d - 1.$$

Proof. This is just claim 1 and claim 2 from [Liu11]. □

Next let $M_n \subset \Gamma$ be a maximal set so that

(1) if $\gamma \in M_n$ then $\gamma B_R(x_0) \subset A_n$,
(2) if $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in M_n$ are distinct then

$$\gamma_1 B_R(x_0) \cap \gamma_2 B_R(x_0) = \emptyset.$$

Then let

$$E_n = M_n \cdot B_R(x_0) \subset X.$$

Lemma A.4. *With the notation above,*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Vol}(E_n)}{\mathrm{Vol}(A_n)} > 0.$$

Proof. Fix some $\delta > 0$ so that if $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$ and

$$\gamma_1 B_\delta(x_0) \cap \gamma_2 B_\delta(x_0) \neq \emptyset,$$

then $\gamma_1 x_0 = \gamma_2 x_0$. Then let $C_0 = \#\{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma x_0 = x_0\}$. Next let

$$N_n = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : r_n - 49R < d(\gamma x_0, x_0) \leq r_n + 49R\}$$

Then

$$\mathrm{Vol}(N_n \cdot B_\delta(x_0)) = \frac{\mathrm{Vol}(B_\delta(x_0))}{C_0} \# N_n.$$

Moreover, since M_n was chosen maximally we have

$$N_n \cdot B_\delta(x_0) \subset M_n \cdot B_{2R+\delta}(x_0).$$

Then since

$$\frac{\mathrm{Vol}(M_n \cdot B_{2R+\delta}(x_0))}{\mathrm{Vol}(M_n \cdot B_R(x_0))} \leq \frac{\mathrm{Vol}(B_{2R+\delta}(x_0))}{\mathrm{Vol}(B_R(x_0))}$$

we have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{Vol}(E_n)}{\# N_n} > 0.$$

So it is enough to show that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\# N_n}{\mathrm{Vol}(A_n)} > 0.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}\# N_n &= \#\{\gamma \in \Gamma : d_X(x_0, \gamma x_0) \leq r_n + 49R\} - \#\{\gamma \in \Gamma : d_X(x_0, \gamma x_0) \leq r_n - 49R\} \\ &\geq C e^{(d-1)(r_n+49R)} - \frac{C_0}{\mathrm{Vol}\, B_\delta(x_0)} \mathrm{Vol}\, B_{r_n-49R}(x_0).\end{aligned}$$

By the Bishop-Gromov volume comparison theorem there exists $C_1 > 0$ so that

$$\mathrm{Vol}\, B_{r_n-49R}(x_0) \leq C_1 e^{(d-1)(r_n-49R)} \text{ for all } n > 0.$$

So

$$\# N_n \geq e^{(d-1)r_n} \Big(C e^{49R} - \frac{C_0 C_1}{\mathrm{Vol}\, B_\delta(x_0)} e^{-49R} \Big).$$

Now C, C_0, C_1 do not depend on $R > 0$ and R is some very large number so we may assume that

$$\Big(C e^{49R} - \frac{C_0 C_1}{\mathrm{Vol}\, B_\delta(x_0)} e^{-49R} \Big) \geq 1.$$

Then

$$\# N_n \geq e^{(d-1)r_n}.$$

Finally, using the volume comparison theorem for annuli (see [KS06]) we see that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\#N_n}{\mathrm{Vol}(A_n)} > 0.$$

□

Now the Laplacian comparison theorem implies that

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \Delta d_0(x) \leq d-1.$$

Combining this estimate with Lemma A.3 and Lemma A.4, there exists a sequence $\gamma_n \in= Mt_n$ so that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}(B_R(x_0))} \int_{\gamma_n B_R(x_0)} \Delta d_0(x) d\,\mathrm{Vol} = d-1$$

Next consider the functions $f_n : B_R(x_0) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f_n(x) = (d_0 \circ \gamma_n)(x) - (d_0 \circ \gamma_n)(x_0) = d(x_0, \gamma_n x) - d(x_0, \gamma_n x_0)$$

Then each f_n is 1-Lipschitz and $f_n(x_0) = 0$, so we can pass to a subsequence so that f_n converges locally uniformally to a function $f : B_R(x_0) \to \mathbb{R}$. Using the Laplacian comparison theorem again implies that $\Delta f \equiv d-1$ in the sense of distributions on $B_R(x_0)$. Then by elliptic regularity, f is C^∞ on $B_R(x_0)$. Moreover, by construction, f is the restriction of some Busemann function to $B_R(x_0)$ and so using Lemma 1 part (1) in [LW10] we see that $\|\nabla f\| \equiv 1$ on $B_R(x_0)$.

Now we fix a sequence $R_n \to \infty$ and repeat the above argument to obtain a function $h_n : B_{R_n}(x_0) \to \mathbb{R}$ which and satisfies $\|\nabla h_n\| \equiv 1$ and $\Delta h_n \equiv d-1$ on $B_{R_n}(x_0)$. Then we can pass to a subsequence so that $h_n \to h$ where $h : X \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\|\nabla h\| \equiv 1$ and $\Delta h \equiv d-1$. Then by Theorem 6 in [LW10], X is isometric to real hyperbolic d-space

Appendix B. Eigenvalues of certain subgroups

Proposition B.1. *Suppose $d \geq 3$, $\Lambda \leq \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is a discrete subgroup, and $G \leq \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ is the Zariski closure of Λ. If*

1. *$G = \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$,*
2. *$d = 2n > 2$ and G is conjugate to $\mathrm{PSp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$,*
3. *$d = 2n+1 > 3$ and G is conjugate to $\mathrm{PSO}(n, n+1)$, or*
4. *$d = 7$ and G is conjugate to the standard realization of G_2 in $\mathrm{PSL}_7(\mathbb{R})$*

then there exists some $\gamma \in \Lambda$ so that

$$\frac{\lambda_1(\gamma)}{\lambda_2(\gamma)} \neq \frac{\lambda_2(\gamma)}{\lambda_3(\gamma)}$$

Proof. By conjugating G we can assume that either $G = \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, $d = 2n > 2$ and $G = \mathrm{PSp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, $d = 2n+1 > 3$ and $G = \mathrm{PSO}(n, n+1)$, or $d = 7$ and G coincides with the standard realization of G_2 in $\mathrm{PSL}_7(\mathbb{R})$.

By the main theorem in [Ben97] it is enough to find some element $g \in G$ so that

$$\frac{\lambda_1(g)}{\lambda_2(g)} \neq \frac{\lambda_2(g)}{\lambda_3(g)}.$$

This is clearly possible when $G = \mathrm{PSL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and $d \geq 3$.

Consider the case when $d = 2n > 2$ and $G = \mathrm{PSp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. Then for any $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \mathbb{R}$, G contains the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & & \\ & & \sigma_n & & & & \\ & & & \sigma_1^{-1} & & & \\ & & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & & \sigma_n^{-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

So picking $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \cdots > \sigma_n > 1$ with $\sigma_1/\sigma_2 \neq \sigma_2/\sigma_3$ does the job.

Consider the case when $d = 2n + 1 > 3$ and $G = \mathrm{PSO}(n, n+1)$. Then for any $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \mathbb{R}$, G contains a matrix g which is conjugate to the block diagonal matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \cosh(\sigma_1) & \sinh(\sigma_1) & & & & & \\ \sinh(\sigma_1) & \cosh(\sigma_1) & & & & & \\ & & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & \cosh(\sigma_n) & \sinh(\sigma_n) & & \\ & & & \sinh(\sigma_n) & \cosh(\sigma_n) & & \\ & & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Notice that this matrix has eigenvalues $e^{\sigma_1}, e^{-\sigma_1}, \dots, e^{\sigma_n}, e^{-\sigma_n}, 1$. So picking $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > \cdots > \sigma_n > 0$ with $\sigma_1 - \sigma_2 \neq \sigma_2 - \sigma_3$ does the job when $n \geq 3$ and picking $\sigma_1 > \sigma_2 > 0$ with $\sigma_1 - \sigma_2 \neq \sigma_2$ does the job when $n = 2$.

Finally consider the case when $d = 7$ and G coincides with the standard realization of G_2 in $\mathrm{PSL}_7(\mathbb{R})$. The standard realization of G_2 in $\mathrm{PSL}_7(\mathbb{R})$ can be described as follows. First let

$$\mathbb{H} = \{a_1 + a_2 i + a_3 j + a_4 k : a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

be the quaternions. Then define the split Cayley algebra $\mathfrak{C}' = \mathbb{H} \oplus \mathbb{H}\, e$ with multiplication

$$(a + be)(c + de) = (ac + \overline{d}b) + (b\overline{c} + da)e.$$

This is an 8-dimensional algebra over $\mathbb{R}$ with conjugation

$$\overline{(a + be)} = \overline{a} - be.$$

Next let $\mathbb{G}_2$ be the $\mathbb{R}$-linear transformations of $\mathfrak{C}'$ which satisfy

$$\alpha(xy) = \alpha(x)\alpha(y).$$

Then for $\alpha \in \mathbb{G}_2$ and $x \in \mathfrak{C}'$ it is straightforward to verify that $\alpha(\overline{x}) = \overline{\alpha(x)}$ (see for instance [Yok77, Proposition 2]). So $\mathbb{G}_2$ preserves the subspace

$$\mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{i, j, k, e, ie, je, ke\}$$

of purely imaginary elements. Since $\alpha(1) = 1$ for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{G}_2$, if we identify i, j, k, e, ie, je, ke with $e_1, \dots, e_7$ the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^7$ we obtain an embedding $\mathbb{G}_2 \hookrightarrow \mathrm{PSL}_7(\mathbb{R})$.

Now if $t, s \in \mathbb{R}$ a tedious calculation shows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \cosh(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sinh(t) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cosh(s) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sinh(s) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cosh(s+t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sinh(s+t) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sinh(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cosh(t) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sinh(s) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cosh(s) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh(s+t) & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cosh(s+t) \end{bmatrix}$$

is contained in the image of this embedding. This matrix has eigenvalues

$$e^t, e^{-t}, e^s, e^{-s}, e^{s+t}, e^{-(s+t)}, 1.$$

So picking $t > s > 0$ with $s \neq t - s$ does the job. □

References

[BCLS15] Martin Bridgeman, Richard Canary, François Labourie, and Andres Sambarino. The pressure metric for Anosov representations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 25(4):1089–1179, 2015.

[Ben97] Y. Benoist. Propriétés asymptotiques des groupes linéaires. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 7(1):1–47, 1997.

[Ben00] Yves Benoist. Automorphismes des cônes convexes. *Invent. Math.*, 141(1):149–193, 2000.

[Ben03] Yves Benoist. Convexes hyperboliques et fonctions quasisymétriques. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (97):181–237, 2003.

[Ben04] Yves Benoist. Convexes divisibles. I. In *Algebraic groups and arithmetic*, pages 339–374. Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Mumbai, 2004.

[Ben08] Yves Benoist. A survey on divisible convex sets. In *Geometry, analysis and topology of discrete groups*, volume 6 of *Adv. Lect. Math. (ALM)*, pages 1–18. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2008.

[BH99] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger. *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, volume 319 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[BH13] Yves Benoist and Dominique Hulin. Cubic differentials and finite volume convex projective surfaces. *Geom. Topol.*, 17(1):595–620, 2013.

[BM12] Thierry Barbot and Quentin Mérigot. Anosov AdS representations are quasi-Fuchsian. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 6(3):441–483, 2012.

[BMZ15] T. Barthelmé, L. Marquis, and A. Zimmer. Entropy rigidity of Hilbert and Riemannian metrics. To appear in *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2015.

[Bou95] Marc Bourdon. Structure conforme au bord et flot géodésique d'un CAT(−1)-espace. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 41(1-2):63–102, 1995.

[BPS16] J. Bochi, R. Potrie, and A. Sambarino. Anosov representations and dominated splittings. *ArXiv e-prints*, May 2016.

[Cal72] Eugenio Calabi. Complete affine hyperspheres. I. In *Symposia Mathematica, Vol. X (Convegno di Geometria Differenziale, INDAM, Rome, 1971)*, pages 19–38. Academic Press, London, 1972.

[CK02] M. Coornaert and G. Knieper. Growth of conjugacy classes in Gromov hyperbolic groups. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 12(3):464–478, 2002.

[CLT15] D. Cooper, D. D. Long, and S. Tillmann. On convex projective manifolds and cusps. *Adv. Math.*, 277:181–251, 2015.

[CM14] Mickaël Crampon and Ludovic Marquis. Finitude géométrique en géométrie de Hilbert. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 64(6):2299–2377, 2014.

[Coo93] Michel Coornaert. Mesures de Patterson-Sullivan sur le bord d'un espace hyperbolique au sens de Gromov. *Pacific J. Math.*, 159(2):241–270, 1993.

[Cra09] Mickaël Crampon. Entropies of strictly convex projective manifolds. *J. Mod. Dyn.*, 3(4):511–547, 2009.

[DGK17a] J. Danciger, F. Guéritaud, and F. Kassel. Convex cocompact actions in real projective geometry. 2017.

[DGK17b] J. Danciger, F. Guéritaud, and F. Kassel. Convex cocompactness in pseudo-Riemannian hyperbolic spaces. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2017.

[Gab92] David Gabai. Convergence groups are Fuchsian groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 136(3):447–510, 1992.

[GGKW15] F. Guéritaud, O. Guichard, F. Kassel, and A. Wienhard. Anosov representations and proper actions. To appear in *Geometry and Topology*, 2015.

[GW12] Olivier Guichard and Anna Wienhard. Anosov representations: domains of discontinuity and applications. *Invent. Math.*, 190(2):357–438, 2012.

[KL06] Bruce Kleiner and Bernhard Leeb. Rigidity of invariant convex sets in symmetric spaces. *Invent. Math.*, 163(3):657–676, 2006.

[KLP13] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb, and J. Porti. Dynamics on flag manifolds: domains of proper discontinuity and cocompactness. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2013.

[KLP14a] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb, and J. Porti. A Morse Lemma for quasigeodesics in symmetric spaces and euclidean buildings. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2014.

[KLP14b] M. Kapovich, B. Leeb, and J. Porti. Morse actions of discrete groups on symmetric space. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2014.

[KS06] Suk-Ho Kang and Jae-Up So. On the relative volume comparison for the annulus. *Korean Ann. Math.*, 23(2):139–149, 2006.

[Lab06] François Labourie. Anosov flows, surface groups and curves in projective space. *Invent. Math.*, 165(1):51–114, 2006.

[Liu11] Gang Liu. A short proof to the rigidity of volume entropy. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 18(1):151–153, 2011.

[Lof01] John C. Loftin. Affine spheres and convex $\mathbb{RP}^n$-manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 123(2):255–274, 2001.

[LW10] François Ledrappier and Xiaodong Wang. An integral formula for the volume entropy with applications to rigidity. *J. Differential Geom.*, 85(3):461–477, 2010.

[Mar14a] Ludovic Marquis. Around groups in Hilbert geometry. In *Handbook of Hilbert geometry*, volume 22 of *IRMA Lect. Math. Theor. Phys.*, pages 207–261. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2014.

[Mar14b] Ludovic Marquis. Around groups in Hilbert geometry. In *Handbook of Hilbert geometry*, volume 22 of *IRMA Lect. Math. Theor. Phys.*, pages 207–261. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2014.

[Mes07] Geoffrey Mess. Lorentz spacetimes of constant curvature. *Geom. Dedicata*, 126:3–45, 2007.

[New92] M. H. A. Newman. *Elements of the topology of plane sets of points*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, second edition, 1992.

[Pap05] Panos Papasoglu. Quasi-isometry invariance of group splittings. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 161(2):759–830, 2005.

[Pra94] Gopal Prasad. **R**-regular elements in Zariski-dense subgroups. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 45(180):541–545, 1994.

[PS14] R. Potrie and A. Sambarino. Eigenvalues and Entropy of a Hitchin representation. To appear in *Inventiones mathematicae*, 2014.

[Qui05] J.-F. Quint. Groupes convexes cocompacts en rang supérieur. *Geom. Dedicata*, 113:1–19, 2005.

[Qui10] Jean-François Quint. Convexes divisibles (d'après Yves Benoist). *Astérisque*, (332):Exp. No. 999, vii, 45–73, 2010. Séminaire Bourbaki. Volume 2008/2009. Exposés 997–1011.

[Sam16] A. Sambarino. On entropy, regularity and rigidity for convex representations of hyperbolic manifolds. *Math. Ann.*, 364(1-2):453–483, 2016.

[Sta68] John R. Stallings. On torsion-free groups with infinitely many ends. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 88:312–334, 1968.

[Sta71] John Stallings. *Group theory and three-dimensional manifolds*. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.-London, 1971. A James K. Whittemore Lecture in Mathematics given at Yale University, 1969, Yale Mathematical Monographs, 4.

[Swa96] G. A. Swarup. On the cut point conjecture. *Electron. Res. Announc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 2(2):98–100 (electronic), 1996.

[Tho15] Nicolas Tholozan. Entropy of Hilbert metrics and length spectrum of Hitchin representations in PSL$(3, \mathbb{R})$. To appear in *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 2015.

[Tuk88] Pekka Tukia. Homeomorphic conjugates of Fuchsian groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 391:1–54, 1988.

[Yok77] Ichiro Yokota. Non-compact simple Lie group G_2' of type G_2. *J. Fac. Sci. Shinshu Univ.*, 12(1):45–52, 1977.

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637.
E-mail address: aazimmer@uchicago.edu